# Language change in 20<sup>th</sup> century written Chinese -

# The claim for Europeanization

Dissertation

zur Erlangung des Grades einer Doktorin der Philosophie

am Fachbereich Asien-Afrika-Wissenschaften

der Universität Hamburg

Vorgelegt

von Ruth Cordes

aus Waiblingen

Hamburg 2014

# Contents

# 1  Introduction

"文法的欧化，是语法史上一桩大事。" *("The Europeanization of grammar has been an event of great consequence in the history of our language." (transl. by Alain Peyraube 2000) Wang Li 1944/45*

*"Only the grammar of the Chinese language remained remarkably stable amidst all these changes."* Alain Peyraube 2000

Linguistic – or language – change happens everywhere and at all times, accelerated by social upheavals, though generally slower in written than in spoken language (cf. Glück 1993: 590). Whereas linguistic change is on some levels so fast it can be easily observed, like phonetic or semantic change, it is generally rather slow on other levels, like grammar (or morphosyntax). In written language, however, the conservative force of the letter is challenged by the possibility to purposefully prefer the one formulation or structure over the other. Where in spoken language people tend to structure their utterances automatically according to patterns acquired since childhood, they can formulate much more consciously in written language, which means that this would be the area where they experiment with new, fashionable expressions or grammatical structures.

The two contradicting views above, by Wang Li and Alain Peyraube, mark the two extremes in the discussion about the origin and extent of linguistic change in 20th century written Chinese. Wang Li, with his broader notion of 语法 *yǔfǎ* – grammar – (including lexicon, stylistics and writing), saw this change as a result of contact with European languages, whereas Alain Peyraube, representing a narrower concept of grammar, found other sources of influence on 20th century written Chinese.

The one point both can agree on is: Written Chinese did change radically since the middle of the 19th century. At the beginning of this process was the highly esteemed Literary Chinese in all variations (or, later, called *wényán* 文言), and the low written

Colloquial Chinese (later known as *báihuà* 白话), which was by traditional scholars considered unfit to express serious contents. The problem was that it took a lot of time to master the literary language, so that huge parts of the society were excluded from literacy. Towards the end of the 19th century, several attempts were made to use a more accessible type of language for newspapers and magazines intended for the reading of larger portions of the society.[1] For the sake of alphabetization of former peasants that were needed as industrial workers, and in the attempt to teach people so they could participate in political discussions and thereby constitute a modern nation, means were sought to allow them to learn how to read and write in a shorter time and, above all, in a language that was near to their spoken language.

Several people were occupied with the improvement of written Chinese: Some with the creation of a phonetic writing for Chinese, similar to the Japanese syllabary or using Latin script as a basis, others with the unification of the pronunciation of Chinese characters. In fact, in 1913 a conference was summoned to define the pronunciation of characters. This again needed a phonetic writing system to record these readings. Also the educational system reflected the switch from Literary to Colloquial Chinese as the subject to teach children in school: Since the 1910s, the language taught was called *guówén* 国文 (national written language), which in 1920 was changed into *guóyǔ* 国语 (national spoken language; until then, the term "national language", *guóyǔ* 国语, referred to the Manju language of the Qing dynasty rulers).

The necessity to reform was felt in nearly every aspect of public life, like the government, educational system, economy and commerce among others (even down to clothing and hairstyle), as well as in language and literature, which in its turn had to serve the modernization.

---

[1]    Starting around 1868 (the year of Huang Zunxians "famous line *wǒ shǒu xiě wǒ kǒu* 'my hand writes as I say with my mouth'", Chen 1999: 70) was the movement for the unification of spoken and written language. The role of *báihuà* as a means of mass education was highlighted by Qiu Tingliang in 1898: "There is no more effective tool than *wényán* for keeping the whole population in ignorance, and there is no more effective tool than *báihuà* for making it wise." (Tan 1956 cited by Chen 1999: 70) Around the Reform Movement of 1898, *báihuà* newspapers, textbooks and dictionaries were published "all around the country" (Chen 1999: 71).

The country that offered itself as a model was Japan, where large numbers of Chinese students went to study abroad, there coming in contact with Western thought. Japan wrote with characters similar to Chinese, but complemented by two syllabaries, it had a national language used in public education, and it also had had its own Westernization of the written language as described by Klingspon-März/Yasui in 1979.

At the beginning of the 20th century, some Chinese scholars tried to find the explanation for the supremacy of European colonial powers in the nature of their languages – like the estimation that "Germany is strong, because its language contains many voiced sounds and China is weak because Mandarin lacks them" (Ramsey 1987: 7 about the linguistic knowledge of the delegates of the 1913 conference on pronunciation).

The New Culture Movement, starting at the middle of the 1910s, brought a great leap forward for the creation of a modern standard language meeting the needs of a modern national state. At that time, written Chinese consisted, according to Chen Ping (1999: 76) of these four types:

1) traditional *wényán* (the major written language used by those who were opposed to *báihuà*),

2) modern *wényán* (incorporating a large amount of new vocabulary borrowed from Japanese or contemporary vernaculars,

3) traditional *báihuà* (the language used in those vernacular literary works handed down from the late Tang dynasty), and

4) new-style *báihuà* (borrowing heavily from Western languages in terms of grammar).

This new-style *báihuà* was the (written) language of the intellectuals of the new culture movement in the 1910s, who were in search of a new language to express the new thoughts of modern times in a new literature, and they did so fervently. Chen (1999: 72) writes:

> Although similar proposals had been put forward several decades earlier, it was
> only due to the enthusiastic and effective promotion by people like Hu Shi,
> Chen Duxiu, Liu Bannong, Qian Xuantong, and Fu Sinian, and in the context of
> rapid social changes, that this proposal gained more and more support.

They were sure that dead *wényán* could not serve as the medium of live literature.

Some of these intellectuals viewed the Chinese language (and the traditional Chinese society) as nearly hopeless. The most extreme representative of them, Qian Xuantong, advocated in a letter to the editor of *Xin Qingnian* magazine, Chen Duxiu, to abolish the Chinese language in toto and to replace it by Esperanto. Others tried to modernize it by "improving" its grammar – among these, Wang Li can be found. I believe it to be most interesting that Wang Li, about ten years before stating the Europeanization of written Chinese grammar in his publications in 1944, tried to Europeanize the same grammar by, e.g., marking word classes. Ten years after his statement of Europeanized grammar, in 1954, he still wrote: "Most good writings in newspapers and magazines can be translated into Russian or English word by word and sentence by sentence, with very little need of changes in their construction" (Translation by Li Chi 1962: 41-2).

The aim to be reached was a language fit for expressing all the new ideas and thoughts that came to China from the West, partly via Japan, and fit for fulfilling the needs of a modern national state – like the European national languages were able to fulfil those needs. On the other hand, there was a lot of influence from western languages, mostly by written texts translated from English, French, Russian, German and other European languages, leaving their traces in an adulterated form of Modern Chinese known as Translationese. Some of these alterations were made consciously, where authors strove for fidelity, some unconsciously or unintended, where lack of time or of competence was responsible for awkward word-for-word translations.

So there were several intellectuals busy improving a written Chinese language felt to be unfit for modern times. At the same time there were already in the 1920s voices that warned about an Europeanization of the Chinese language, like Ke in 1928.

Now I would like to come back to the two statements of Wang Li in 1944 and of Alain Peyraube in 2000 quoted at the top. The main question is: Who was right – or less wrong?

In my thesis, I will investigate who of the two linguists (and those who published their contributions in between) quoted above was right. Was it Wang Li with his biased view

on the desired Europeanization? Or was it Peyraube with his comparably narrower understanding of grammar and his view on historical influences in written Chinese? What happened to the written Chinese language in the 20th century? What changes in written grammar are described by the different authors? And what about other, non European influences, like Japanese or Chinese dialects?

Whether or not European languages, above all English, exerted a strong enough influence on written Chinese to change its morphology and syntax, is discussed controversially. Changes attributed to contact with English, French or German, might instead originate from much older contact with other Chinese as well as non-Chinese languages. Furthermore, this would be much more fitting the traditional definition of language contact.

Nevertheless, Heine and Kuteva (2005) showed that, other than supposed earlier, "the transfer of grammatical meanings and structures across languages is regular, and […] it is shaped by universal processes of grammatical change." (Heine/Kuteva 2005: 1). They list as

> Kinds of linguistic transfer
> a) Form, that is, sounds or combinations of sounds
> b) Meanings (including grammatical meanings or functions) or combinations of meanings
> c) Form-meaning units or combinations of form-meaning units
> d) Syntactic relations, that is, the order of meaningful elements
> e) Any combination of (a) through (d) (Heine/Kuteva 2005: 2)

In the earlier stages in the first half of the 20th century, Europeanization was demanded – the first author to do so was Fu Sinian in 1919 – and rejected – like by Hertze Ke in 1928 –, but not systematically investigated. The first one to do so was Wang Li in his two chapters on Europeanized grammar in 1944. After him, others made Europeanization the subject of investigation as shown in chapters 2 and 3.

When Wang Li wrote in the 1940ies his grammars of Chinese (his Chinese being the *báihuà* – written colloquial – of early Qing novels), he closed in both books with a

chapter on "Europeanized grammar", showing instances of Modern Written Chinese grammatical usages that were allegedly formerly unknown in Written Chinese and attributing them to contact phenomena with European languages, above all English. About 60 years later Alain Peyraube challenged Wang Li's view and that of his successors, explaining that most of these instances were existent already before any contact to European languages.

Europeanization (*ōuhuà* 欧化) is still today a frequently discussed subject in Chinese academic journals and even in monographs, like those by He Yang 2008 or Clara Ho-Yan Chan 2011. Where in earlier contributions the authors tended to take over Wang Li's examples and follow his line, the application of corpus linguistic methods emerged in the 21$^{st}$ century. Most publications include both pros and cons, good and bad examples of Europeanization, and thus enter the discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of the Westernization of China. For example, earlier calls for the internationalization of the Chinese written language from the middle of the 20$^{th}$ century were in the 1990ies countered by cultural linguists like Shen Xiaolong in search of "Chineseness". There are two different intertwining currents, one ideological current pro and contra Europeanization (or Westernization, or modernization, or internationalization), and one current concerned with the standardization (and by this way modernization) of the language.

Because there is so much ideological overload, so much repetition in the examples and comparatively little proof of quantitative facts, I want to check the statements by the different authors against a corpus of 20$^{th}$ century written Chinese. Mine are the questions of quantity and of chronological distribution. It may well be that a certain phenomenon showed first in a certain text, but at what time was it most common? Did its usage increase slowly but linear or fast and temporary? What happened to it at what time? Did it gain acceptance? Or was it rejected as too exotic? And what sort of texts was affected?

To investigate the number of Europeanized phenomena in the written Chinese grammar and the degree of Europeanization in five periods of the 20$^{th}$ century, I will check the statements of the different authors on Europeanization against a corpus. The corpus I

use is the core corpus of a larger planned corpus, containing four registers (of eleven planned) from different periods in the 20th century.

Why use a corpus? Because today it is no longer possible to pursue so-called "armchair linguistics", because the processing of large amounts of data is now possible, the linguist does not have to fall back on his or her knowledge of the language under observation, but can check his or her observations against a quantity of samples, and realize quantitative analyses.

As no existing modern Chinese written language corpus meets the requirements diachronicity, random selection and traceability, therefore a new corpus had to be built. Originally planned were 11 registers ranging from diaries to scientific prose, partly originally Chinese, partly translated into Chinese, following Biber/Finegan/Atkinson 1994. These were: diaries, essays, narrative prose (originally in Chinese), narrative prose (translated into Chinese), textbooks for primary school: readers, textbooks for secondary school: history, news reportage (from two different newspapers), academic prose: spoken and written language (originally in Chinese), academic prose: spoken and written language (translated into Chinese), scientific prose: medicine (originally in Chinese), and scientific prose: medicine (translated into Chinese). Of these, four were chosen for the core corpus: essays, narrative prose Chinese, narrative prose translated, and newspaper reportage. The process of sampling is described in chapter 4 "Corpus".

Still, even if this corpus is diachronic, randomly selected and traceable, it is a raw corpus, meaning that it is neither part-of-speech-tagged nor parsed. Therefore it is not possible to search for certain parts of speech or certain word classes, only for characters and, of course, regardless of their function in that particular sample, be it as verb, noun, adverb or conjunction. Thus some of the more interesting phenomena of Europeanized grammar, like an increase of subjects, cannot be investigated.

For the originally planned corpus, the 20th century was divided into 5 periods of different length, each register containing 5 samples per period, each sample consisting of ~5,000 characters totalling 1,375,000 characters. This corpus was reduced to working size with 4 different registers: narrative prose Chinese (小说 *xiǎoshuō*, xs), narrative

prose translated (翻译小说 *fānyì xiǎoshuō*, fy), essays (散文 *sǎnwén*, sw), and newspaper reportage (日报 *rìbào*, rb) containing 3-5 samples per register and period with the exception of essays, which is missing in period I, totalling 424,000 characters in 86 samples. For more details see chapter 4.

The thesis is divided into 6 chapters. In chapter 2, "The call for Europeanization", I try to show the background of such fervent claim for Europeanization. In chapter 3, "The Europeanization hypothesis: Participants in the discussion on Europeanized grammar", I introduce seven authors, starting with Wang Li, and their contribution to the discussion of the Europeanization of Chinese grammar. Chapter 4 is dedicated to the corpus and shows both why I needed a corpus of my own and how I built it. Chapter 5, "The examples" is the main chapter of the thesis, here all examples are listed, investigated and interpreted. The text closes with chapter 6, "Summary and conclusion".

In the "problem of nomenclature" (Norman 1988: 135ff.) I follow Norman, who describes *báihuà* as

> [t]he vernacular literary language as opposed to the Classical literary language, *wényán*. Such a vernacular-based form of written Chinese has been employed since Tang and Song times. Its use was originally limited to certain genres of popular literature; after the May Fourth Movement, it became the ordinary form of written Chinese. (Norman 1988: 136)

Kaske 1999 elaborates

> "Baihua", meaning the rhetorical opposite of "wenyan" (the classical Chinese written language), was invented by educator-reformers in the circles around Liang Qichao in the late 1890s. It was used mainly as the name for a simple language designed to communicate modern ideas to a broader range of people. (Kaske 1999)

He Yang speaks of old and new baihua (*jiù báihuà* 旧白话, *xīn báihuà* 新白话) before and after May Fourth. (He 2008: 2).

In this work, I use Pinyin as found in the sources, some words with, others without mark of their tones. The same applies for the characters (traditional or simplified), which I use according to the sources.

# 2 The call for Europeanization

The observation and description of Europeanized grammar, like by Wang Li in his two chapters in *Zhongguo xiandai yufa* and *Zhongguo yufa lilun*, was preceded by its demand. More then a quarter of a century before Wang Li ascertained the Europeanized grammar in written texts of certain intellectuals, there was the call for Europeanization and the discussion of its necessity, benefits and disadvantages, as will be shown in this chapter.

The perception of the Chinese language as deficient and ill suited for modern times by Chinese intellectuals was itself preceded by the judgement of European philosophers of the 18th and 19th century. Heiner Roetz cites Johann Gottfried Herder's view on Chinese in his 2006 article "Die chinesische Sprache und das chinesische Denken. Positionen einer Debatte": „So sieht er [Herder] Sprache und Schrift für die ‚Sklavencultur' der Chinesen und ihren Mangel an ‚denkendem Geist' als mitverantwortlich." (Roetz 2006: 10) and Wilhelm von Humboldt in the same article: "Sprachen mit ‚wahrer Flexion', wie sie die gerade entdeckte indoeuropäische Sprachfamilie (Humboldt spricht von den ‚sanskritischen Sprachen') kennt, sind Sprachen mit einem ‚Mangel aller Andeutung der Kategorien der Wörter, wie er sich im Chinesischen zeigt', überlegen." (Roetz 2006: 11) and proceeds: "Die von Humboldt nicht ohne Kautelen, aber letztlich doch deutlich postulierte Überlegenheit des indoeuropäischen Sprachtyps liefert, so scheint es, einen Schlüssel zum Verständnis des globalen Siegeszugs des Westens." (Roetz 2006: 13). This triumphant advance of the West was confronted with the alleged ahistorical and timeless nature of the Chinese language: "[Wolfgang] Bauer sieht in der ‚Struktur der Sprache' und im traditionellen Familiensystem die beiden ‚vorgegebenen Grundmächte in China', an denen jede Innovation scheitert." (Bauer 2001: 75 cited by Roetz 2006: 23).

This shattering view on Chinese was in circulation at the same time as huge numbers of Chinese students went to Europe and to Japan to study abroad. They brought back not only the European's low opinion of Chinese language and culture, but also the concept

of a modern national standard language for a modern nation state, like in Japan or Europe.

A standard language is defined as "[a] codified variety of a language that serves the multiple and complex communicative needs of a speech community that has either achieved modernization or has the desire of achieving it" (Garvin 1993: 41).

Since the second half of the 19th century, the modernization of China was a big issue. Becoming a modern national state included modernization of economy, policy, military, administration and government, philosophy and everyday culture. It also included the education of more people than before, as well as the phonetization of the writing to achieve this goal, and finally the modernization of the language.

Chinese intellectuals looked at Europe and Japan and perceived a close connection between power and national language. If a national language was the prerequisite for power, then they wanted to have one for China as well. One of the advantages of such a modern, standardized, national language, they hoped, would be its nationwide unifying force. This unification was first to be obtained by codifying the standard pronunciation of several thousand characters, which was attempted at the beginning of the 20th century. Later on, also lexicon and grammar shifted into the focus of standardization.

Much more radical were the participants in the "New Culture Movement", circling around the magazine *Xin Qingnian* (La Jeunesse). For them, the question was not how to unify the pronunciation, but how to create a new language for the new literature. In 1917, Hu Shi published his famous article "Preliminary views on the reform of literature" (文学改良刍议 Wenxue gailiang chuyi) in *Xin Qingnian*. Here he was, according to Chen Zhanbiao, "first raising the 'banner of righteousness' of literary revolution (Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 832), bringing forward the "eight don'ts" of literary revolution, starting from "form" and "spirit" (Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 832). According to Chen Zhanbiao, Hu Shi later believed that "of these eight items the most important is 'use *Baihua*'".[2]

---

[2]  "八项中最重要的是'用白话'". *Hu Shi wen ji* vol. 12, 1998: p. 53 cited by Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 832.

In Hu Shi's eyes, the creation of a new literary tool was the prerequisite for the creation of a new literature: "If we want to create new literature, we first have to prepare the creation of a new literary 'tool'".[3]

> So how can literature become renewed? Certainly first the tool must be liberated, the tool of literature, that is spoken and written language; if the tool does not change, it must not be called new, only when the tool is liberated, the content of literature can be easily enlivened.[4]

And further:

> While everybody believes that reform should start from content, I believe that literature is founded in writing, and writing is founded in language; talking is the foundation of writing, writing is the foundation of literature, as it is also the tool of all literature.[5]

One year later, in 1918, Qian Xuantong proposed the abolition of Chinese and its replacement by the artificial language Esperanto. What had happened? At that time, not only the Chinese language was perceived to be preventing modernization, but everything Chinese, from the government system through everyday life to language was, in the eyes of reformers, backward and antique and unable to meet the needs of an evolving nation. Their remedy for this problem was Europeanization.

According to Guo Hongjie (2007: 21), Fu Sinian's article on "Zenyang zuo baihua wen" (怎样做白话文: How to write Baihua texts), published in 1919, was the first one to advocate the Europeanization of Chinese written language. "In our methods to create words we must follow the habits of Western languages and use Western peoples'

---

[3]    "我们要创造新文学，也须先预备下创造新文学的'工具'". *Hu Shi wen ji* vol. 2, 1998: p. 50 cited by Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 832.

[4]    "文学要怎样才能新呢？必定先要解放工具，文学之工具，是语言文字，工具不变，不得谓之新，工具解放了，然后文学底内容，才容易活动起来。" *Hu Shi wen ji* vol. 12, 1998: p. 21 cited by Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 832.

[5]    "在大家都觉得应该从内容改革起，我觉得文学是根据文字，而文字是根据语言；说话是文字的根本，文字是文学的根本，也是一切文学的工具。" *Hu Shi wen ji* vol. 12, p. 76-77 cited by Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 832.

flavour in expression. And finally we must straightforward use the style of Western written texts, the grammar, morphology, syntax…"[6]

Chen Zhanbiao (2006) cites the same article by Fu Sinian:

> Fu Sinian […] proposes the necessity of as well as the benefits for conscientious expression by the Europeanization of Chinese: "*Baihua* cannot avoid 'Europeanization', only Europeanized *Baihua* can respond to the new demands of a new era. Europeanized *Baihua* has sufficiently assimilated the accurate structure of Western languages, so that our writing can transmit complicated thoughts and intricate theories."[7]

As the reason for this necessity to Europeanize Chinese written language, Fu Sinian points out the deficiency of Chinese: Compared to Western languages, Chinese "only has many simple sentences, very few complex sentences, on a very shallow level".[8] "Now we use *Baihua* to write, the first matter to feel bitter about is our national language, which is extremely straightforward, extremely withered, and little achieving a pleasant impression, not being suitable for literature".[9] "The *Baihua* we use, and the

---

[6]  "我们造词的方法，不得不随西洋语言的习惯，用西洋人表示的意味。而最终就是要直用西洋文的款式，文法，词法，句法..." (Fu Sinian cited by Guo Hongjie 郭鸿杰, "现代汉语欧化研究综述" (Xiandai Hanyu Ouhua yanjiu zongshu: A Literature Review of Europeanization in Modern Standard Chinese). In: *Xi'an waiguoyu daxue xuebao* (2007), p. 21).

[7]  "傅斯年曾也在《怎样做白话文》中提到汉语欧化的必要以及有助于汉语表达的细密的主张，"白话文必不能避免'欧化',只有欧化的白话方才能够应付新时代的新需要。欧化的白话文就是充分吸收西洋语言的细密的结构，使我们的文字能够传达复杂的思想，曲折的理论。" (Ouyang Zhesheng zhubian. 欧阳哲生主编. Hu Shi 胡适. Hu Shi wenji 胡适文集 (1) Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe 1998: p.130, cited by Chen Zhanbiao 陈占彪. "论 '五四' 文字革命的 '欧化' 理论 (Lun 'wu si' wenzi geming de 'ouhua' lilun: On the 'Europeanization' theory in the May Fourth revolution of written language) 2006, p. 835).

[8]  比如傅斯年认为，与西方语言相比，汉语"只多单句，很少复句，层次极浅"in "Zenyang zuo baihua wen", Fu Sinian 1919. Cited by Zhang Yanqun 2008: 148.

[9]  "现在我们使用白话做问，第一件感觉苦痛的事情，就是我们的国语，异常质直，异常干枯，少得余味，不适用于文学". Fu Sinian 1919 cited by Zhang Yanqun 2008: 148.

*Wenyan* we use, suffer the same defect, which is being very simple in the structure",
therefore it is very difficult to convey the meaning satisfactorily.[10]

Fu Sinian might have been the earliest to call for Europeanization of the written
language in public, but he was not the only one. His view on Chinese, either literary or
colloquial, as being ill suited as a modern national language for a modern nation state
was shared by others like Lu Xun, who stated "in Chinese written or spoken language,
the method is indeed too imprecise".[11]

> The secret of success in writing a composition is to avoid familiar words
> and delete function words, so that then this is good writing; when talking,
> words often fail to convey one's thoughts, words are insufficient.
> Therefore, when a teacher explains the contents of a textbook, he has to
> fall back on the use of chalk. This lack of precision in grammar is
> testifying the lack of precision in thinking, in other words, the mind is a
> little confused. If one always uses muddled speech, even when reading,
> even if the words are flowing smoothly, but in the final analysis, what one
> gets is still a muddled vague impression.[12]

Qu Qiubai expressed more precisely what was lacking: "All adjectives, verbs,
prepositions that express minute distinctions and complex matter are almost
inexistent".[13] He formulated the devastating judgment:

> The Chinese language (writing) is so poor, even articles of everyday use
> are without name. The language of China simply has not completely left

---

[10]　"我们使用的白话，同我们使用的文言，犯了一样的毛病，也是 […] 组织上非常简单" […] 很
难圆满地传达意思。" Fu Sinian 1919 cited by Zhang Yanqun 2008: 148.

[11]　"中国的文或话，法子实在太不精密了。" Zhang Yanqun 2008: 148 citing *Lu Xun quan ji* vol. 4,
1984: p. 382.

[12]　"作文的秘诀，是在避去熟字，删掉虚字，就是好文章，讲话的时候，也时时要辞不达意，这
就是话不够用，所以教员讲书，也必须借助于粉笔。这语法的不精密，就在证明思路的不精密，
换一句话，就是脑筋有些胡涂。倘若永远用着胡涂话，即使读的时候，滔滔而下，但归根结蒂，
所得的还是一个胡涂的影子。" Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 834 quoting *Lu Xun quan ji* vol.4, 1981: 383.

[13]　"一切表现细腻的分别和复杂的关系的形容词，动词，前置词，几乎没有。" Qu Qiubai 瞿秋白.
Guanyu fanyi de tongxin (A letter about translation 关于翻译的通信) in Lu Xun 鲁迅. Er xin ji 二心
集. 1995: 179 cited by Zhang Yanqun 2008: 148.

the so-called 'sign language (姿势语) degree – general everyday speech is almost still not able to separate itself from 'sign language'. Naturally, all adjectives, verbs, prepositions expressing precise differences and complex relations do nearly not exist. … Under these circumstances the creation of a new language is an extraordinarily important duty.[14]

Qu Qiubai saw the remedy for this language so unfit for modern times in translation:

Translation – apart from being able to introduce the contents of the original text to the Chinese reader – has another important function: that is to help us create a new Chinese modern language … translation can certainly help us create many new words, new syntax, an abundant lexicon and a smooth, precise, correct expression.[15]

Translation was also for Lu Xun the key for the improvement of Chinese. Because of the "insufficiency of Chinese grammar",[16] he wanted, by direct translation, to attract the way of expression of foreign languages into Chinese as unaltered as possible and hence push forward the modernisation of Chinese.[17] Therefore, when translating, he also

did not break up the long sentences of the original into 'several sentences', and even 'did not change much the phrase order', mostly because he

---

[14] "中国的言语（文字）是那么穷乏，甚至于日常用品都是无名氏的。中国的言语简直没有完全脱离所谓'姿势语'的程度 – 普通的日常谈话几乎还离不开'手势戏'。自然，一切表现细腻的分别和复杂的关系的形容词，动词，前置词，几乎没有。… 这种情形之下，创造新的言语是非常重大的任务。"Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 834, citing *Lu Xun quan ji*, vol. 4, 1981: 371. Zhang Yanqun cites the central part of this citation: "一切表现细腻的分别…前置词，几乎没有" written by Qu Qiubai in a letter to Lu Xun, "Guanyu fanyi de tongxin" 关于翻译的通信, in: Lu Xun. Er xin ji 1995: p. 179.

[15] "翻译 – 除出能够介绍原本的内容给中国读者以外 – 还有一个很重要的作用：就是帮助我们创造出新的中国的现代语言…翻译，的确可以帮助我们造出许多新的字眼，新的句法，丰富的字汇和细腻的精密的正确的表现。" *Qu Qiubai wenji* (2). Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe 1953: p. 918, cited by Zhang Yanqun 2008: 149.

[16] "中国原有的语法是不够的。""Chinese traditional grammar is not sufficient." Lu Xun "Da Cao Juren xiansheng xin" ("答曹聚仁先生信": Answering the letter of Mr. Cao Juren) cited by Zhang Yanqun 2008: 148.

[17] "于是，他想通过直译，把外国语的表现法力求不加改变地引到汉语中来，并以此来推动汉语的现代化。" Zhang Yanqun 2008: 148.

wanted to transplant the structure of Western languages into Chinese.[18]
The method Lu Xun used when translating was the 'forced translation'
method: word-by-word translation even to the point of using English word
formation as standard.[19]

Lu Xun declared "support literary works in the Europeanized form".[20] According to
Guo Hongjie (2007: 21), Lu Xun thought that to use sentences with a deep Indo-
European impression could not only introduce new things and new thoughts, but also
absorb new ways of expression to make modern texts richer, more distinct and more
precise (Guo 2007: 21). Chen Zhanbiao (2006: 834) cites Lu Xun: "The big reason for
the penetration of Europeanized (written) grammar into Chinese Baihua is not at all
because of curiosity, but because of necessity".[21] Lu Xun advocated the forced
translation "rather sincere than smooth", because "these translations cannot only import
new contents, but also new ways of expression." (Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 834, citing *Lu
Xun quan ji* vol. 4, p. 371). Concerning the "not smooth" (*bù shùn* 不顺) appearance of
translated texts, Lu Xun was confident that this would "only be temporary, after
becoming accustomed to it one would feel it to be smooth. If it were really not smooth,
then it would be dropped by natural selection."[22]

Chen Zhanbiao (2006: 835) points out the basic difference between Hu Shi's and Lu
Xun's approach, the first concentrating on the popularization of *Baihua*, the second on
its improvement. He cites Hu Shi's general praise of Chinese:

---

[18]    "[…]甚至'语句的前后次序不甚颠倒',主要是因为他想把西文的长句结构移植到汉语中来
[…]"Zhang Yanqun 2008: 148.

[19]    "鲁迅在翻译时用的是'逐字译'甚至以英文的构词法来规范汉语使用的'硬译'方法。" Zhang
Yanqun 2008: 149.

[20]    "支持欧化式的文章", cited by Guo Hongjie 2007: 21.

[21]    "欧化文法的侵入中国白话中的大原因,并非因为好奇,乃是为了必要。" Chen Zhanbiao
(2006: 834) and Zhang Yanqun (2008: 149) citing Lu Xun (*Lu Xun quan ji* vol. 5), Beijing: Renmin
wenxue cbs, 1981: 520.

[22]    "这种不顺他相信只是暂时的,习惯了就会觉得顺了。若是真不顺,那会被自然淘汰掉的。"
Zhang Yanqun 2008: 150 quoting Zhu Ziqing (1946) *Lu Xun xiansheng de Zhongguo yuwen guan* (Mr.
Lu Xun's view on Chinese language 鲁迅先生的中国语文观) in: Yu Guangzhong 余光中. *Yu
Guangzhong tan fanyi* (Yu Guangzhong discusses translation 余光中谈翻译). Beijing: Zhongguo
duiwai fanyi chuban gongsi, 2002: 91.

> Our language, reflecting contemporary linguistic theories, is most simple
> and most astute, there is not one point that is ungrammatical, there is no
> place that is not conforming to theory, which is generally acknowledged
> by scholars of the whole world. And it is not only me flattering us. The
> Chinese language is in the world of today the highest in evolution.[23]

Chen Zhanbiao continues quoting Hu Shi's approval of Chinese and his estimation of
the quality of *Baihua* – the simpler, the easier, the more evolved, the higher in level –,
easy to learn by reading the novels of standard authors, without the necessity of learning
grammar; but with only a couple hundred characters as foundation enabling everybody
to read and write in a short time, so that even small children would not commit
grammatical errors (Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 835 citing *Hu Shi wen ji* vol. 12, p.47). As a
reason for these attractive qualities Hu Shi gave the natural and unspoilt character of
Chinese:

> Because the national language underwent two thousand years'
> unrestrained evolution, and was never subjected to interference by
> scholars, or to precocious codifications and stipulations, therefore the
> grammar of the national language is, the more it changes, the simpler and
> more convenient, so it became the world's simplest and most reasonable
> grammar.[24]

Neither in favour of this "most simple and most convenient national language" nor in
favour of Europeanized grammar was the "mass language" (*dàzhòngyǔ* 大众语)
movement, and with it Qu Qiubai. Zhang Yanqun (2008) writes

> In the eyes of the opponents, the biggest shortcoming of Europeanized
> translations was that "only members of the knowledge society are

---

[23]  "我们的语言，照今日的文法理论上讲起来，最简单最精明，无一点不合文法，无一处不合伦
理，这是世界上学者所公认的。不是我一个人恭维我们自己。中国的语言，今日在世界上，为
进化之最高者。" *Hu Shi wen ji* vol. 12, p.24, cited by Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 835.

[24]  "因为国语经过二千年的自由进化，不曾受文人学士的干涉，不曾受太早熟的写定与规定，故
国语的文法越变越简单，越变越方便，就成了一种全世界最简单最有理的文法。" Chen
Zhanbiao 2006: 835 quoting *Hu Shi wen ji* vol. 8, p.22.

accustomed to using [this type of language], but the ordinary masses are
not at all accustomed to using it." [25]

Qu Qiubai also pointed out that

translation must allow the common people to understand by reading,
because only when the common people understand, translation can bring
active political function into play. Even at the time when via translation
new words and new modes of expression are introduced, these words and
syntactic patterns also must be able to be expressed orally, allowing the
spoken language of the masses to gradually assimilate them.[26]

Lu Xun in his turn exhorted the members of the mass language movement: "Some
people speak highly of 'mass language' and oppose 'Europeanized texts', this is talking
with eyes shut and not facing reality."[27]

Lu Xun advocated Europeanization to improve *Baihua*:

Do the best to make Baihua easy to understand and clear, to allow the
people who can understand it to increase, but the exact so called
"Europeanized" language still should be supported, because if talking
needs to be exact, the original Chinese grammar is not sufficient, and the
mass language of China also very soon cannot continue muddling
eternally.[28]

---

[25]   "在反对者眼中，欧化翻译最大的缺点在于这种语言"只有知识社会的人用惯了它，一般民众并没有用惯"". Zhang Yanqun 2008: 150. Zhang does not mention his source explicitly, but it probably belongs to *Qu Qiubai wenji* vol. 2. Beijing: Renmin wenxue cbs. 1953, p. 930.

[26]   "翻译必须要让普通大众看得懂，因为只有普通大众看得懂，翻译才能发挥积极的政治作用。即使是透过翻译输入新名词、新表现方法时，这些字眼和句法也是要口头上说得出来，好让群众的言语能够渐渐地容纳它们。" *Qu Qiubai wenji* vol. 2. Beijing: Renmin wenxue cbs., 1953: p. 918.

[27]   "一些人高抬"大众语"，反对"欧化文"，是闭着眼睛说话，没有正视现实。" Zhang Yanqun 2008: 150. Zhang does not give his source, only its author.

[28]   "竭力将白话做的浅豁，使能懂的人增多，但精密的所谓'欧化'语文，仍应支持，因为讲话倘要精密，中国原有的语法是不够的，而中国的大众语文，也快不会永久含胡下去。" *Lu Xun quan ji* vol. 6. Beijing: Renmin wenxue cbs. 1981: p.77, in Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 835).

Emotions rose high on this matter, as Chen Zhanbiao (2006: 834) shows by the following contemporary reaction to Lu Xun:

> After seeing [Lu Xun's] discussion about advocating the "necessity" of Europeanization, the section chief of the translation department of the National Government's Legislative Yuan at that time, Wen Gongzhi, flustered and frustrated brought the terrible and ridiculous accusation that Lu Xun was "manipulated by the imperialists" and wanted to "sell out the whole nation". (Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 834 quoting Li etc. 1996: 976)[29]

The connection between language reform and politics was very close at that time. Language was a political issue, this showed already in the paragraph on a national standardized language. Beginning in the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century with the highly emotional attempt to standardize the pronunciation of characters, the language reform movement spread out to phonetization of the script, standardization of vocabulary and, in the 1950s, standardization of grammar. It discussed the question which dialect was to become the standard, or how a standard language should be artificially created. It discussed the question if alphabetization should be attempted in each person's first language, which was in most cases a dialect or regiolect, or in some common language. The language reform movement was a very important part of the new culture movement with its interest in every aspect of European life, and it was also part of the *Zhōng tǐ xī yòng* 中体西用 – debate (Chinese essence and western utility).

> In any case, by the late 1920's the new prose was instantiated in most vernacular writing because the Euro-Japanese style of literal translation lent itself rapidly to the habits of Chinese writers. As early as 1921 the influential editor of *Xiaoshuo yuebao* (Fiction monthly), Mao Dun, had promoted the adoption of Europeanization in the vernacular-based writing as a "necessary method in an age of transition and experiment to change

---

[29]  "在看到他主张欧化的"必要"的言论后，当时的国民政府立法院编译处股长文公直就气急败坏地称鲁迅是'受了帝国主义者的指使'，要'将整个民族出卖'的可怕而可笑的帽子。" Chen Zhanbiao 2006: 834.

attitudes toward literature and to improve conventional grammar
habitually used for thousands of years" (1921: 16) (Gunn, E., 1991: 105)

That all these calls for Europeanized Chinese seem to have had quite some impact is also implied by a 1928 article of Hertze C.K. Ke in *The China Journal*, who had noticed the phenomenon of Europeanization of Baihua in contemporary newspapers and magazines:

> As is well known to the general newspaper and magazine reading public, that the Chinese language, as employed by the "new" literary men, has during the past few years worn a European garment. Chinese words, but European grammar, gender, punctuation (dashes often extravagantly used), lengthy sentences, long series of similar words and phrases, *if* and *though* clauses placed after their principal clauses – these are some of the things we find! (Ke 1928: 116)

According to Ke, Chinese did not in the least lack what was necessary for modern times, but probably the users of language did lack competence.

> If Yen Fuh (嚴復) and his followers could express Western thought in classical Chinese, there is no reason why we should not do so in modern Chinese (of course, by "modern Chinese" I do not mean Europeanized Chinese). If we cannot, it is merely because our command of Chinese is not good enough. It is not the language itself, but the men who use it, that are incapable of expressing Western thought. Good tools cannot make bad workers do good work. (Ke 1928: 117)

Ke called into question the language skills of contemporary English-Chinese translators and at the same time all programmatic claims for Europeanization:

> Europeanized Chinese is, I dare say, but a convenient invention of the third-rate translators, who, either because of their poor Chinese or because they sometimes find in the Western works which they are translating such intricate and abstruse expressions as they know not what to make of, still less how to turn into their mother tongue, have created this linguistic

22

anomaly as an easy-chair wherein they can sit, passing for perfect experts
in translation.

He saw little reason why Europeanized Chinese should spread.

As Europeanized Chinese is less readable than "Chinese Chinese," so is it
less read – and no wonder – to say nothing of the fact that whoever does
not know any European language will necessarily feel it, since it is as hard
to understand as it is tedious to read. (Ke 1928: 118)

And probably he would have been right if those "less readable" texts he wrote about had
not been of tremendous political impact. But as it was, these Marxist-Leninist texts that
transported their English, Russian, German original syntax into Chinese were of such
importance that they could not be ignored. Also, texts that were originally written in
Chinese imitated the European mode of expression, so that Wang Li in 1954 could state
that "good articles can be translated into English or Russian one to one" (Wang 1954).
Many of these texts were dogmatic, some of them had to be learned by heart.

# 3 The Europeanization hypothesis: Participants in the discussion on Europeanized grammar

## 3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to introduce the main participants in the discussion on the Europeanization of Chinese grammar. Although there are some more authors discussing Europeanization, not all of them did their own research nor gave their own examples, but rather repeated what others – strictly speaking one other, namely Wang Li – had written before. I will introduce four of the five authors cited by A. Peyraube 2000 (these are Wang Li, C. Kubler, Xie Yaoji and E. Gunn) and sketch the main contents of their works,[30] adding Beijing Normal University and Li Chi.

## 3.2 Wang Li

Wang Li was probably the most productive and certainly one of the most eminent Chinese linguists in the 20th century. He did not only publish more than 50 monographs and over 200 articles on a large variety of linguistic themes, but he also wrote a plain and generally understandable style, which might have added to his wide reception. Born in 1900, he studied in Beijing at Tsinghua University (taught by Chao Yuen Ren and Liang Qichao) and in Paris.

The Europeanization of the Chinese language was stated, demanded or rejected during the 1920ies and 1930ies, but not studied systematically. Wang Li seems to have been

---

[30] The fifth author cited by A. Peyraube is Ma Meng, who in his 1962 lecture dealt with standardization of pronunciation, simplification of characters and adoption of new terms, but hardly touched grammatical change. See Ma, Meng (1963): "Recent changes in the Chinese language. A lecture delivered on 18th June, 1962". In: *Journal of the Hong Kong Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*: 51-59.

the first one who did this,[31] and he did so twice at the same time in his two complementary grammar works *Zhōngguó xiàndài yǔfǎ* 中国现代语法 (Modern Chinese grammar) and *Zhōngguó yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 中国语法理论 (Theory of Chinese grammar). These were originally the teaching materials for his lecture on 'Modern Chinese grammar', held in 1938 at Southwest United University at Kunming. One of the two, the *Zhōngguó xiàndài yǔfǎ*, was designed as a students' textbook on Chinese grammar focussing on rules, the other, *Zhōngguó yǔfǎ lǐlùn*, as its more theoretical counterpart providing background information for teachers and the linguistically interested reader. Both contain a chapter 6 titled 'Ōuhuà de yǔfǎ' 欧化的语法 (Europeanized grammar), divided into the sections

> 41: *Fùyīncí de chuàngzào* 复音词的创造 (Creation of disyllabic words)
>
> 42: *Zhǔyǔ hé xìcí de zēngjiā* 主语和系词的增加 (Increase of subjects and copulas)
>
> 43: *Jùzi de yáncháng* 句子的延长 (Extension of sentences)
>
> 44: *Kěnéngshì, bèidòngshì, jìhào de Ōuhuà* 可能式、被动式、记号的欧化 (Europeanization of potential mood, passive voice and markers)
>
> 45: *Liánjié chéngfen de Ōuhuà* 联结成分的欧化 (Europeanization of conjunctive and connective elements)
>
> 46: *Xīn tìdàifǎ hé xīn chēngshùfǎ* 新替代法和新称数法 (New ways of using personal pronouns and substitution, new ways of using numbers).

*Zhōngguó yǔfǎ lǐlùn* additionally contains one section

> 47: *Xīn shěnglüèfǎ, xīn dǎozhuāngfǎ, xīn chāyǔfǎ jí qítā* 新省略法、新倒装法、新插语法及其他 (New methods of omission, inversion, insertion, and others).

---

[31]  To my knowledge. C. Kubler calls him 'the author of the only really comprehensive treatment of Europeanized Chinese' (1985:23).

This was neither the first nor the last time Wang Li wrote about Europeanization. In his 1934 article on language change "Yǔyán de biànqiān" 語言的變遷 he prepared the field by advocating a reform of the grammar with the aim of improving the Chinese language: "vague and ambiguous speech can become clear, illogical speech can become logical".[32] He admitted that reform of the lexicon is easiest, reform of phonology more difficult and reform of grammar most difficult, because it implies the reform of language concepts (*yǔyán guānniàn* 语言观念); and a reform of the grammar would influence the 'driving habits' ("habitudes motrices" *zhǔdòng xíguàn* 主动习惯. French translation by Wang Li in the original). Nevertheless, he points out that grammatical reform is easier to accomplish in written language, where, in contrast to spoken language, there is always enough time to consider and change one's habits.[33]

In 1936 he reflected on the possibility of Europeanization of Chinese written grammar ("Zhōngguó wénfǎ Ōuhuà de kěnéngxìng" 中國文法歐化的可能性) – in case of a future Romanization. He held that though the replacement of Chinese characters by Latin script was still far away, one should be prepared and consider in time how Chinese word classes could be unambiguously identified by adding markers for verbs, adverbs, adjectives and by capitalization of nouns once the characters would cease to help in distinguishing homophones.

In 1954 he did not write about Europeanization anymore, but about the benefits of internationalization for the developing standard language of the Han people ("Lùn Hànzǔ biāozhǔnyǔ" 論漢族標準語). After explaining the necessity of a standard language, he took up Mao Zedongs demands pronounced in his "Fǎndùi dǎngbāgǔ" 反對黨八股 speech at Yan'an 1942. Regarding the second demand, "absorb what we need from foreign languages", he not only justified the adoption of "new words to express new concepts", but also acclaimed the internationalization of Chinese grammar. This

---

[32] *Wáng Lì Wénjì*, vol. 20 (1991), p. 437: "许多模糊两可的话，都可以因语法上的改革而成为显明的；许多不合逻辑的话，都可以因语法上的改革而成为合逻辑的."

[33] *Wáng Lì Wénjì*, vol. 20 (1991), p. 438: "又譬如现在的文人写起文章来往往掺杂了些欧化的语法，然而说起话来仍旧不能那样欧化，这也因为写文章能有充分的时间去改变他们的"主动习惯"，而说话就没有充分的时间."

would result in a closer structure and a more explicit meaning. He observed that "[t]he Chinese language has also made great progress in its [grammatical] construction as a whole. Most good writings in newspapers and magazines can be translated into Russian or English word by word and sentence by sentence, with very little need of changes in their construction."[34]

Wang Li may have been the first one to study systematically the influences of European languages on Chinese, but he was not the last one. His influence on the discussion of Europeanization of Chinese grammar left a wide trail, and his assessment that "the Europeanization of grammar has been an event of great consequence in the history of our language"[35] is until today the point of reference quoted at the beginning of articles on Europeanization.[36]

## 3.3  Beijing Normal University

Ten years after the proclamation of the People's Republic in 1949, the authors of *Wǔ-sì yǐlái Hànyǔ shūmiàn yǔyán de biànqiān hé fāzhǎn* 五四以来汉语书面语言的变迁和发展 (Changes and developments in Chinese written language since the May Fourth movement) did not speak about "Europeanization" anymore, but about "new and developing grammar" (*xīnxīng de yǔfǎ* 新兴的語法), nevertheless ascribing many changes in the written language to influences by Indo-European languages. The book was published in 1959 by the Chinese language department of Běijīng shīfàn xuéyuàn (Beijing Normal University). To commemorate the 40th anniversary of the May Fourth movement, the editors summarized the changes in written Chinese, with an emphasis on newspaper texts and other functional texts (*yìngyòngwén* 应用文) as rather conservative text types, and secondary school Chinese language textbooks, which are important for

---

[34]  *Wáng Lì Wénjì*, vol. 20 (1991), p. 64: "现在报纸杂志上的好文章，差不多可以逐词逐句译成俄文或英文，不需要在结构上有什么大更动。" Translation by Li Chi 1962: 41-2.

[35]  *Wáng Lì Wénjì*, vol. 1 (1984), p. 434: 文法的欧化，是语法史上一桩大事。Translation by C. Kubler 1985: 23.

[36]  E.g. see Guo Hongjie 2007: 21, He Yang 2008: 16, Zhang Fengjie 2009: 119.

their normative and standardizing function – as the whole book was written in a time when standardization not only of grammar was one of the biggest issues.

The book is divided into three parts: The first part is about general trends of change in written Chinese (p. 1-73), the second part about lexical innovations (p. 74-135), treating the development from 1898 to 1911 and that since 1919, the third part about the developments in Chinese grammar, divided into morphology and syntax. The part on morphological development contains the chapters

1.1 *Yì xiē cí de xíngtài de fēngfù* 一些詞的形态的丰富 (The enrichment of the morphology of some words)

1.1.1 *Tāchēngdàicí de "xìng" de fēnhuà* 他称代詞的"性"的分化 (The differentiation of gender of the 3rd person pronoun "*tā*")

1.1.2 *Míngcí, dàicí de "shù" de fāzhǎn* 名詞、代詞的"数"的发展 (The development of "number" of nouns and pronouns)

1.1.3 *Dòngcí de "tǐ" de fāzhǎn* 动詞的"体"的发展 (The development of "aspect" of verbs)

1.2 *Yì xiē cí de gōngyòng de guīfàn* 一些詞的功用的规范 (The standardization of use of some words)

1.2.1 *Dàicí "nà" de fēnhuà* 代詞"那"的分化 (The differentiation of the pronoun "*nà*")

1.2.2 *Jiècí "de" de fēnhuà* 介詞"的"的分化 (The differentiation of the preposition [sic!] "de")

1.2.3 *Jiècí hé liáncí de fēngōng* 介詞和連詞的分工 (The division of function of prepositions and conjunctions)

1.3 *Yì xiē cí de yòngfǎ de kuòdà* 一些詞的用法的扩大 (The extension of usage of some words)

1.3.1 *Chēngwèidàicí bèi xiūshì* 称谓代詞被修飾 (The modification of appellative pronouns)

1.3.2 *Fùcí láiyuán de kuòdà* 副詞来源的扩大 (The extension of the origin of adverbs)

1.3.3 *Liáncí "hé" yòngfǎ de kuòdà* 連詞"和"用法的扩大 (The

extension of the use of the conjunction "*hé*")

1.3.4 *Liáncí "rúguǒ" yòngfǎ de kuòdà* 連詞"如果"用法的扩大 (The extenstion of the use of the conjunction "*rúguǒ*"),

the part on syntactical development contains the chapters

2.1 *Jùfǎ jiégòu de fùzá hé jīngmì* 句法結構的复杂和精密 (The complexity and accuracy of syntactic structures)

2.1.1 *Fùjiāchéngfèn de fùzáhuà* 附加成分的复杂化 (Affixes/supplements becoming more complex)

2.1.2 *Bāoyùnjù de fùzáhuà* 包孕句的复杂化 (Embedded sentences becoming more complex)

2.1.3 *Gǔgànchéngfèn de zēngduō* 骨干成分的增多 (The increase of mainstay elements)

2.2 *Jùfǎ jiégòu de jiǎnliànhuà* 句法結构的简练化 (The syntactic structure becoming more succinct)

2.2.1 *Xīnxīng de chéngfèn gòngyòngfǎ* 新兴的成分共用法 (The new and developing usage of elements in more than one function)

2.2.2 *Xīnxīng de chéngfèn shěnglüèfǎ* 新兴的成分省略法 (The new and developing omittance of elements)

2.2.3 *Zhǔ-wèi jiāoróngjù de xīn fāzhǎn* 主謂交融句的新发展 (The new development of sentences with merging subject and predicate)

2.3 *Jùfǎ jiégòu de duōyànghuà* 句法結构的多样化 (The diversification of syntactic structure)

2.3.1 *Xīnxīng de tóngwèi jiégòu* 新兴的同位結构 (New and developing appositions)

2.3.2 *Yǔxù de fāzhǎn* 語序的发展 (The development of word order / morpheme sequence).

The tenor of the whole book is an appraisal of the newly developed *báihuà* as the written standard, as changes in lexicon and grammar are inseparably linked to social and political changes, which they reflect.

# 3.4  Li Chi

Li Chi published her study on *New Features in Chinese Grammatical Usage* in 1962 at the Center for Chinese Studies, Institute of International Studies, University of California as no. 9 of the Studies in Chinese Communist Terminology series. Two years earlier, in 1960, she had already published a translation of the *Provisional System of Grammar for Teaching Chinese* (*Zànnǐ Hànyǔ jiàoxué yǔfǎ xìtǒng* 暫擬漢語教學語法系統) and an article on "The Influence of the Russian language in Modern Chinese".[37]

She did not append a bibliography to her study, but cited such authors as Wang Li (both grammars mentioned above), Lü Shuxiang and Zhu Dexi (*Yǔfǎ xiūcí jiǎnghuà* 語法修辭講話), the correspondence between Qu Qiubai and Lu Xun, and Li Jinxi (report given on April 25, 1951, on problems of grammar and rhetoric, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) in her introduction. Although the foreword implies that her study is rather subjective and personal, it is nevertheless an important addition to Wang Li's study, being composed 20 years and one social upheaval later. It shows clearly that there was some linguistic development not at all foreseen by Wang Li in the 1940ies – like the use of monosyllabic words for slogans or the power of the traditional four-character idioms.[38] The study is arranged into two parts, each containing several chapters:

> Development in Word-Composition
> 1. Increase in simple dissyllabic words and compounds
> 2. Increase in the use of affixation
> 3. The use of monosyllabic words for slogans
> 4. The power of the traditional four-character idioms
> 5. The use of antithetical expressions
> 6. The use of abbreviations
>
> New Grammatical Forms

---

[37] "Der Einfluß der russischen Sprache auf das moderne Chinesisch", in *Osteuropa*, edited by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Osteuropakunde.

[38] Four-character idioms are idiomatic expressions or set phrases, mostly originating from literary sources and widely known and used for certain pragmatic functions, e.g. giving weight to one's own statement.

1. *I-wei-chao* 意味着 *yu-chao* 有着

2. *Ti* 地

3. *Yü* 於

4. *Tsai* 在

5. *Pei* 被

6. *Yu-so* 有所

7. *Chia-i* 加以

8. *Wei...erh* 爲-而

9. *I...wei* 以-爲

10. *T'ung-shih* 同時

11. *Yü tz'u t'ung-shih* 與此同時

12. *Wei-le* 為了

13. *Yu-yü* 由於

14. *Ts'ung-erh* 從而

15. *Erh* 而

16. *Ming-ch'üeh* 明确

17. *Fen-sui* 粉碎

18. *Yün-hsü* 允许

19. Others

It is important to notice that Li Chi, in contrast to Wang Li in the 1940ies, does not ascribe all the structures discussed to European influence, but also to influences from Japanese and Chinese literary languages. In her introduction she emphasized that the term "*ōuhuà*" 歐化 (Europeanization) for the new grammatical constructions therefore was incorrect.[39]

---

[39]  „It should be noted here that the new grammatical constructions came from more than one source, but because the influence of Western, chiefly English, grammatical constructions has been pre-eminent, the general term for them has until recently been the incorrect term *ou-hua* 歐化 (Europeanization). Li Chi 1962: 1.

## 3.5  Cornelius C. Kubler

Cornelius C. Kubler's *Study of Europeanized grammar in modern written Chinese*, published in 1985, is a revised version of his Master's thesis titled 'Europeanized grammar in Ba Jin's novel *Jia*' (1975, Cornell University), where he compared the language of the first edition of *Jia* 家 of 1931 and that of the revised edition of 1957 with the language of *Ér-nǚ yīngxióng zhuàn* 兒女英雄傳. The work is divided into four parts:

    I. Introductory

        1.1 Introduction

        1.2 Language Contact and Linguistic Theory

        1.3 Brief History of Western Language Influence on Chinese

        1.4 Influence of Western Languages on the Written Style of Ba Jin')

    II. Morphology

        2.1 The Pluralizer *–men*

        2.2 The Adverbial Suffix *–de*

        2.3 The Progressive Suffix *–zhe*

        2.4 Other Types of Morphological Influence

    III. Syntax

        3.1 The Neuter Pronouns *tā* and *tāmen*

        3.2 Increase of Subjects

        3.3 The Passive with *bèi*

        3.4 The Auxiliary *zài*

        3.5 Position of Phrases with the Coverb *zài*

        3.6 Position of Speaker in Direct Quotations

        3.7 Position of Clauses with *suīrán*

        3.8 The Use of *dāng*

        3.9 Adjectival Clauses with Pronominal Heads

        3.10 Increase in the Degree of Embedding

        3.11 Other Types of Syntactic Influences

    IV. Conclusions

        4.1 General

        4.2 Contributions of This Thesis to Chinese Linguistics

The title contains the manifesto much in the same way as Wang Li's title 'Ōuhuà de yǔfǎ' does – the changes are seen as the result of language contact influence of European languages on Chinese.

## 3.6  Edward Gunn

Edward Gunn's work *Rewriting Chinese. Style and innovation in twentieth-century Chinese prose*, published 1991, is bipartite, consisting of a discussion on conventions, aesthetic prescriptions, the influence of social history on stylistics, and the stylistic creativity of Chinese authors between 1918 and 1986, and an equally large appendix containing numerous examples of stylistic innovations from the works of approximately twelve dozen authors.

In mapping the sources of these stylistic innovations E. Gunn differentiated more than one possible origin, although some of his ascriptions are doubted by A. Peyraube. He classified the grammatical and stylistic innovations as 'indigenous prior to 1918', 'indigenous since 1918', 'Euro-Japanese features prior to 1918' and 'Euro-Japanese features since 1918' and the extra category 'cohesion', thus clearly stating that Japanese had its contributions to contact influence on Chinese as well.

## 3.7  Xie Yaoji

The work of Xie Yaoji 謝耀基 A. Peyraube refers to was published 1990 under the title *Xiàndài Hànyǔ Ōuhuà yǔfǎ gǎilùn* 現代漢語歐化語法概論, which is unfortunately unavailable to me. Instead, I will refer to his article titled 'Hànyǔ yǔfǎ Ōuhuà zōngshù' 汉语语法欧化综述 published in *Yǔwén Yánjiǔ* 1/2001 as well as to the table of contents and abstract of his M.A. thesis *Xiàndài Hànyǔ Ōuhuà yǔfǎ yánjiǔ* 現代漢語歐化語法研究 published 1989 at Hongkong University.

In both publications, of 1989 and of 2001, he did not only list the changed structures of words, phrases, and sentences, but also raised the topics of standardization of

Europeanized grammar in Modern Chinese and of 'good and evil of Europeanization'. The examples he mentioned do not differ from those brought forward by Wang Li half a century earlier; but in his evaluation of Europeanization he is convinced that 'through westernization new nutrients are supplied to the Chinese language and its expressive power is enhanced, as long as it is not unduly setting impact and violating the traditional usage of Chinese'.[40]

## 3.8 Alain Peyraube

Alain Peyraube's 2000 article "Westernization of Chinese Grammar in the 20th Century: Myth or Reality?" is the first study to my knowledge enquiring into the probability of an asserted Europeanization or Westernization of Chinese Grammar. Mainly, he took the different examples for Europeanized grammar put forward by Wang Li, Cornelius Kubler, Edward Gunn or Xie Yaoji. Contrary to what his predecessors in this discussion wrote, he showed that most of the structures attributed to European influences since the late 19th century did exist already in times not suspect of any European influence on the Chinese language, with the exception of a few syntactical structures influenced by European or, at least in one case, Japanese syntax. Thus, the changes in the grammar of written Chinese are due to other factors than borrowing from European languages.

## 3.9 He Yang

The work of He Yang, *Xiàndài Hànyǔ ōhuà yǔfǎ xiànxiàng yánjiū* 现代汉语欧化语法现象研究, published in 2008, is remarkable for its quantitative approach based on comprehensible corpora. He contrasted Old Baihua with New Baihua (since around May 4th 1919), written language with spoken language, and contemporary written Chinese with English (He 2008: 36f.). The corpora he uses are „Jiātíng cángshū jíjǐn" 《家庭藏书集锦》 (Hongqi publishing house), „Zhōngguó gǔdiǎn míngzhù xīn bǎi bù"《中国古典名著新百部》 (Beijing Yinguan electronic publishing company), „Guóxué bèi lǎn" 《国学备览》 (Commercial press) and „Èrshíwǔ shǐ quánwén yuèdú jiǎnsuǒ xìtǒng" 《二十五史全文阅读检索系统》 (Nankai Daxue, Tianjin) as well as

---

[40] Analogous from Xie Yaoji's 1989 Abstract.

the spoken Chinese corpus „Běijīng huà kǒuyǔ yǔliàokù" 《北京话口语语料库》
(about 950 thousand characters, recorded in the 1980ies) (He 2008: 38). The corpora of
written Chinese comprise Baihua literature from the 14th to the 18th century, samples
of modern (*xiàndài xiǎoshuō* 现代小说) and of contemporary novels (*dāngdài xiǎoshuō*
当代小说), contemporary translated novels, contemporary social sciences treatises, and
others. The results of He's investigations are, owing to his quantitative approach, much
more diverse than those by his predecessors.

He's main objectives include
(1) to conduct, according to the facts in the history of Chinese, a verification and
discrimination of phenomena of Europeanized grammar that have been mentioned or
not yet mentioned, as well as determine if they are of Europeanized nature and of what
kind of Europeanization,
(2) to describe the transformation process of various kinds of phenomena of
Europeanized grammar and of originally Chinese grammatical forms, to explain the
continual development or gradual vanishing of these instances of Europeanized
grammar, or coexistence with Chinese traditional forms, or their actual or potential
replacement,
(3) on the foundation of the above mentioned investigation and analysis induce the
characteristics, channels, patterns, consequences and limitations of foreign influence on
Chinese grammar since May Fourth,
(4) according to the investigation results of Chinese Europeanized grammar answer
theoretical questions about the differences between direct and indirect language contact,
as well as if and to what extent the grammatical system of one language can be
influenced by another language.[41]

---

[41] 具体说来，本项研究要达到的主要目标包括：
  （1）依据汉语史的事实，对人们已提及的和未提及的欧化语法现象进行考证和甄别，确定其
是否具有欧化的性质，并说明其为何种类型的欧化。
  （2）描述各种欧化语法现象与汉语原有语法形式此消彼长的演变过程，说明这些欧化语法现
象是在继续发展，还是正在逐渐消失，是与汉语的传统并存，还是已经或者可能取而代之。
  （3）在以上考察和分析的基础上，归纳五四以来汉语语法接受外来影响的特点、途径、方式、
后果和限度。
  （4）依据汉语欧化语法现象的研究结果，回答直接语言接触与间接语言接触的差异，以及在

To summarise, Wang Li, the former advocate of Europeanization, had his focus in the 1940ies on Europeanization, with C. Kubler 1985 and Xie Yaoji 1990/2000 following him closely. The main focus of the authors from Beijing Normal University 1959 was on standardization. Li Chi concentrated 1962 on new features and on the adoption of elements of literary Chinese in colloquial Chinese. E. Gunns main concern in 1991 was innovation and the adoption of regiolect influences on written Chinese, whereas He Yang 2008 was the first one to apply quantitative analysis.

---

间接语言接触中，一种语言的语法系统是否会受到以及会在何种程度上受到另一种语言的影响等若干理论问题。(He 2008: 1f.)

# 4  The Corpus

## 4.1  Reasons for using a corpus in this study

The different statements that have been made on the degree of Europeanization during the 20th century are presented in the introduction in chapter 1. The reasons for stating this Europeanization are discussed in chapter 2. At this point, the method of substantiating these statements by carefully chosen examples is brought into focus.

Until a few decades ago, linguists simply had to fall back on their own or other persons' language competence, or on written texts they had at hand, for supporting their assumptions on what is right and what is not in the studied language, or what is common and what is rare. Even if the single scholar was highly erudite, his data was limited. Nowadays, as larger and larger digitized corpora set the standards for linguistic work, this kind of „armchair linguistics"[42] is becoming questionable in comparison to the assumed objectivity of corpus linguistics.

This applies also for Wang Li's argumentation in his discussion of the Europeanized grammar he found in the written language of certain authors. The evidence he brought forward in the 1940ies supported his observations, but was put in perspective sixty years later by Alain Peyraube, who brought forward other evidence in refuting Wang Li's statements. As Peyraube did not draw upon a corpus either, but on chosen examples, his argumentation should be no less questionable.

A carefully designed diachronic corpus might as well prove that the chosen examples do indeed reflect the language of a certain time and are in accordance with the findings, as it might prove that the selection was biased.

For the attempt to substantiate either Wang Li's or Alain Peyraube's point of view on the Europeanization/Westernization of the Chinese language in the 20th century, a

---

[42] "Armchair linguistics" as opposed to corpus linguistcs: Fillmore (1992) cited by Kytö/Rissanen (1997: 9).

corpus is needed that covers at least the 20th century and contains text samples of different registers evenly distributed and randomly selected. It should also contain metadata on the samples, i.e. data concerning the authors as well as the source of the samples, so that the background of the different texts and their authors can be taken into account.

These requirements are more or less those described in works dealing with diachronic corpus design (Biber/Finegan/Atkinson 1994, Hickey/Kytö/Lancashire/Rissanen 1997, Biber/Conrad/Reppen 1998 and Kennedy 1998), like random selection, register variation, continuous or at least comparable registers, and distribution over time.[43]

## 4.2  Existing corpora

There exist quite a number of Chinese language corpora, which are listed in the appendix ➜ Table Corpora (see Schindelin 2005a, Xiao 2005, Xiao 2006). The majority of these corpora are synchronic and covering a single year, or near synchronic, seeing that although they are growing and more samples are added each year, they still started only lately, reaching back a decade at most. Two of the corpora consist of Ancient Chinese and Early Chinese.

Even the one corpus that would best fulfil the requirements, the Chinese National Corpus (*Guójiā yǔwěi yǔliàokù* 国家语委语料库)[44], has its drawbacks. On the one hand, it covers the years 1919 to 2000 and beyond and thereby almost the entire 20th century, it contains most of the data and metadata needed for this work and it is designed as a balanced corpus. On the other hand, there was the temporary inaccessibility of the corpus while working on this thesis,[45] and the problematic sampling frame. Neither are the samples evenly distributed over time, nor was the sampling of narrative prose done randomly. Instead, samples included in the CNC (China National Corpus) "should

---

[43]  For the question of balancing see especially Kennedy 1998: 62ff.

[44]  www.cncorpus.org, accessed 16.07.2014 17:58.

[45]  It is now, July 2014, again accessible.

possess corresponding popularity and representativeness".[46] The problem with this approach is that these samples tend to represent not so much the actual language of a certain time, but the language of certain writings nowadays deemed worth to serve as an example.[47] The uneven distribution of samples over the years since 1919 additionally rises the suspicion that this might not be a diachronic corpus after all, but a synchronic corpus mirroring the proportion of texts of different dates of origin as met nowadays by the average reader.

A carefully designed corpus does not guarantee objectivity by itself, as it might be carefully designed to support certain perspectives. This bias can be avoided only by random selection of the texts, and only if the population of eligible works is large enough.[48]

# 4.3  Corpus design

The task, therefore, was to compile a diachronic corpus covering the 20th century from 1900 to 1999, consisting of randomly selected text samples of different registers that had been chosen to represent a broad variety of written Chinese.

## 4.3.1  Preliminary considerations

### 4.3.1.1  Categories/registers

In the selection of categories I largely followed the selection of written registers for the ARCHER-Corpus (see Biber/Finegan/Atkinson 1994), with a few alterations and the extension by translations, thus ending up with:

diaries

essays

narrative prose (originally in Chinese)

narrative prose (translated into Chinese)

---

[46]  "应具有相当的普及性，代表性。" cncorpus.org/resources/CorpusIntroduction2012.pdf.

[47]  See also Liu 1995, chapter 8, on the question of "Canon, Theory and Legitimation".

[48]  See Biber/Finegan/Atkinson (1994: 5).

textbooks for primary school: readers

textbooks for secondary school: history

news reportage (from two different newspapers)

academic prose: spoken and written language (originally in Chinese)

academic prose: spoken and written language (translated into Chinese)

scientific prose: medicine (originally in Chinese)

scientific prose: medicine (translated into Chinese).

In contrast to ARCHER, this selection does not contain "letters", for reasons of availability, but instead contains "essays" as a genuinely Chinese register located somewhere at the informal-private end of argumentative-expository text types, presumably with a high proportion of literary Chinese in period I, turning to a high proportion of vernacular during period II.[49] Instead of "legal opinion" the register "academic prose: language" was selected, for the same reason of availability as well as reflecting Chinese intellectual life better than the former. Additionally, this selection contains textbooks, which played an important role in fixing, transmitting and promulgating the newly established national language. Three of the categories have been divided into the subcategories "originally Chinese" and "translated into Chinese". As translation is considered one of the main sources of Europeanized grammar, the comparison between the two subcategories of one text type might shed valuable light on the validity of this thesis.

The ARCHER registers are sorted from informal to formal. It is not quite sure if the same applies for the Chinese registers in the original ARCHER order given above. It might turn out that e.g. Chinese diaries are on a higher formality level than British or American diaries.

### 4.3.1.2  *Distribution over time*

The one hundred years between 1900 and 1999 were divided into five periods of different length following rather political (and sociolinguistic) than strictly temporal

---

[49]  As suggested by Williams 2001: 566f. Additionally, "essays" were probably the register best suited for experiments.

divisions, namely 1900-1911 (12 years), the last years of the Chinese empire, 1912-1927 (16 years), the years of the emerging Chinese republic and the era of warlords, 1928-1949 (22 years), the years of the established republic, 1950-1976 (27 years), the Maoist years, and finally 1977-1999 (23 years) as the post-Maoist era.

To reach a more or less even distribution over the different lengths of periods, I divided each period into five parts, trying to collect titles edited in 1900, 1903, 1906, 1909 and 1911 for Period I, in 1914, 1917, 1920, 1923 and 1926 for Period II, in 1930, 1934, 1938, 1942 and 1946 for Period III, in 1950, 1956, 1962, 1970 and 1973 (shift due to the availability of bibliographies) for Period IV, and in 1978, 1983, 1988, 1993 and 1999 for Period V.

### 4.3.1.3   *Number, size and origin of samples*

From each of these five periods five samples of each category were to be selected, each sample consisting of about 5,000 characters (or, in the case of news reportage, of 2,500 characters twice). The samples were to be taken from the middle of the text, starting from a chapter heading if existent or either from a paragraph and going down until a length between 5,000 and 5,100 characters as counted by the word processing software (AntConc, the corpus analysis software, counts approx. 4.96 % more, but is not very accurate) was reached, so as not to cut off parts from the last sentence which might contain information necessary for understanding. The size of 5,000 characters was chosen as the approximate equivalent in Chinese writing to the 2,000-word-size of samples in English corpora, which is assumed to be sufficient for the investigation of grammatical features. The Chinese National Corpus, 国家语委语料库 uses samples of approx. 2,000 characters (+/- 500), the Lancaster Corpus of Mandarin Chinese uses samples of 3,200 characters each.

As bibliographies of whole books were the basis for sampling, the selected titles would very probably in most cases contain more than 5,000 characters – though not necessarily always – so that a portion of 5,000 had to be cut out. To take this portion from either the beginning or the end of the book would mean to sample the forewords, introductions and epilogues preceding or following the text itself. To avoid this, it was

decided to cut the samples from the middle of the text, beginning, if possible, with the beginning of a chapter, paragraph or similar, and going on until the count of 5,000 characters (including punctuation marks) was full and the end of a sentence reached.

To increase the probability that at least one of the texts would be available, three per year were to be selected from the bibliographies. To obtain these three samples, I divided the number of entries inside this year by three and selected the last entries of the first, second and third third.

Table 4-1: Distribution of samples

| Period →<br><br>Register ↓ | | 1900-1911<br>I | 1912-1927<br>II | 1928-1949<br>III | 1950-1976<br>IV | 1977-1999<br>V | planned total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Diaries | | 5 samples of 5000 characters each = 25,000 char. | 5 samples of 5000 characters each = 25,000 char. | 5 samples of 5000 characters each = 25,000 char. | *not appearing in biblio-graphies* | 5 samples of 5000 characters each = 25,000 char. | 125,000 *100,000* |
| narrative prose | Chinese original | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 125,000 |
| | translated into Chinese | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 125,000 |
| Essays | | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 125,000 |
| textbooks readers primary | | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 125,000 |
| textbooks history secondary | | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 125,000 |
| newspaper I: news reportage | | 5 samples of 2,500 char. each | 5 x 2,500 | 5 x 2,500 | 5 x 2,500 | 5 x 2,500 | 62,500 |
| newspaper II: news reportage | | 5 samples of 2,500 char. each | 5 x 2,500 | 5 x 2,500 | 5 x 2,500 | 5 x 2,500 | 62,500 |
| academic prose: language | Chinese original | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 125,000 |
| | translated into Chinese | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | *[new selection]* | 5 x 5,000 | 125,000 *100,000* |
| scientific prose: medicine | Chinese original | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 125,000 |
| | translated into Chinese | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 5 x 5,000 | 125,000 |
| | | | | | | | 1.325 m |

### *4.3.1.4   Random selection*

As random selection comes first on the list of requirements, a comparatively large pool (or population, the term used by Biber/Finegan/Atkinson 1994) of titles is needed from which the samples of one category can be selected at random, e.g. by dividing a list of titles published in a certain year evenly and taking the last entry of each part accordingly – this approach was chosen for most of the categories, with the exception of news reportage, where the samples were to be chosen by page and date through all years.

To allow this approach, the pool of titles has to be sorted – or sortable – both by year and category. This applies for library catalogues or bibliographies. For reasons of traceability, reliability, and, above all, availability, I chose printed editions of bibliographies, starting with the *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue zongshumu* by Jia Zhifang et al. (1993) for essays, narrative prose Chinese and narrative prose translated, subsequently continuing with *Minguo shiqi zongshumu (1911-1949)* for diaries, essays, narrative prose, textbooks, academic and scientific prose edited between 1912 and 1949. For the years since 1949 I used the *Quanguo zongshumu* of the according years. For textbooks since 1949 I used the *Renmin jiaoyu chubanshe shumu 1950-1999*.[50]

## 4.3.2   The process of selecting texts: a working diary on difficulties and other interesting findings

During this process of collecting titles and selecting texts, I met several challenges, which are recorded below.

---

[50]   I am very thankful to Claudia Schneider of the Georg-Eckert-Institut für internationale Schulbuchforschung, who not only called my attention to but also provided me with this bibliography of textbooks edited by the People's Education Press between 1950 and 1999.

### 4.3.2.1 Register

The register question proved one of the largest problems. Like Biber/Conrad/Reppen (2006: 252) observe, registers don't necessarily stay the same, and in the case of 20th century written Chinese probably not even in the course of a mere hundred years.[51]

An even more serious problem is that I had to rely on the bibliography publishers' categorization, and that does not follow the same criteria through all periods. Categories that exist in one bibliography don't exist in others, or are included in another of the selected registers, e.g. diaries in *sanwen* (essays). I chose the approach suggested by Biber/Conrad/Reppen (2006: 252) and followed the publishers' categorization, leaving for later the task of analysing the bibliography publishers' criteria for naming and renaming registers.

Closely related is the problem of discontinuous registers, like the diaries mentioned above, appearing first as category of their own and later being incorporated into another one. Diaries are numerous during the two republican periods (1912-1926, 1927-1949) but nearly vanish after 1949, except of the various editions of the *Diary of Lei Feng*. In the *Quanguo zongshumu* of 1949-1954 the category "diaries" is marked "lacking", and isn't even mentioned any more in the later bibliographies, though occasionally entries with "*riji*" (diary) in their titles appear in the category *sanwen*, like the aforementioned *Diary of Lei Feng* in the 1973 bibliography. The problem of discontinuous register became most acute in the originally included category "academic prose: sociology", to be filled in by sociological theories. These were published abundantly in the late 1920ies and 1930ies, and re-emerge in the 1990ies, but scarcely exist before the mid-1920ies and not at all in the Maoist era (where in 1970 even "history" – at least as a bibliographical category – ceased to exist). In the end, it was decided to switch to the bibliographical category of "spoken and written language" (汉语与汉字 or 语言、文字) instead.

---

[51] Kohnen (1997) discusses the problem of classifying text types, intensified for diachronic corpora by text type evolution. He suggests to look at text types as types of social activity.

### 4.3.2.2  Distribution over time

The idea was to collect samples evenly distributed over the according periods, three per year from each register, as mentioned above, hoping that at least one of the texts would be available.

Generally, it was not always possible to find texts in the required registers in the reference years. So, if there were less than the three entries I needed as a minimum in one year, I added the following year, and, if still insufficient, the preceding year as well, handling this larger pool of entries by the same method, i.e. dividing it by three. If this still did not suffice, I allowed as much as two years backward and forward. These cases are recorded in the Working process record.

### 4.3.2.3  Divergence of time of origin and publication time

Another intricacy is the question of how close the dates of composition and of publication might or might not be. In the case of diaries the publication date is often considerably later than the time the diary relates – though the diary might have been written any time between the related events and the edition date(s). Most diaries listed in the *Minguo shiqi zongshumu (1911-1949)* were edited in the 1930ies and 1940ies, and very few entries show earlier edition dates. Still, the recorded years explicitly named in the title or elsewhere in the bibliography's entry, actually cover the 1910s (11% of the 47diaries relating the years 1912-1949), 1920s (34%), 1930s (43%) and 1940s (12%).

Basically, the decision in which period to include a diary should depend on the year(s) it relates, or better, if traceable, the year it was written. Thus, a diary might appear in a much later bibliography and still be incorporated in the earlier period, though there is always the possibility that it had been altered stylistically or grammatically in the time between its first record and its later publication. [52]

The same applies for essays. Some show considerably earlier dates of first publication (and therefore of composition) than the anthology appearing in a bibliography. Anyhow,

---

[52]  For a collection of authors' alterations see Ni Baoyuan 1992.

in the case of essays and diaries a discrepancy between record and publication, or first and subsequent publication, becomes after all visible, while it might exist in the other categories as well.

### 4.3.2.4   *Narrative prose originally Chinese*

The *Minguo shiqi zongshumu (1911-1949)* divides the category of 小说 *xiǎoshuō*, "fiction", into 笔记小说 *bǐjì xiǎoshuō* (literary sketches), 传奇 *chuánqí*, 话本 *huàběn*, 说唱小说等 *shuōchàng xiǎoshuō děng* (legend, poetic dramas, prosimetric fiction etc.) , 章回小说 *zhānghuí xiǎoshuō* (fiction in chapters), 其他旧小说 *qítā jiù xiǎoshuō* (other old fiction), 民国以来旧小说 *mínguó yǐlái jiù xiǎoshuō* (old fiction since Republic), 新体小说 *xīntǐ xiǎoshuō* (new style fiction), and 故事 *gùshi* (stories), the *literary sketches* being further divided by dynasty (Han to Republic). In accordance with the approach applied in selecting translations (see 3.2.5), I first determined the ratio of "old style" (*literary sketches* through *old fiction since Republic*) versus "new style" (*new style fiction*) entries inside one preselected year, not counting the *stories*, as this register seems to be a very new one, its entries covering only 1917 and the 1930ies and 1940ies. Also, the translations had to be subtracted from the "new style" entries. The second step then was to determine if in that specific year the "old style" outnumbered the "new style" entries or vice versa, and to take the entries of the larger category as pool from which to select three titles – if this was "new style", then the samples should be taken from the *short story* (短篇小说 *duǎnpiān xiǎoshuō*) subcategory, if it was "old style", the samples should be taken from the largest of its subcategories, resulting in either *old fiction since Republic* or *fiction in chapters*.

In the whole of *Minguo shiqi zongshumu (1911-1949)*, the *literary sketches* through *other old fiction* categories comprise approx. 1700-1800 entries (from Han dynasty to Republic), the *old fiction since Republic* 340 entries, and the *new style fiction* approx. 3700-3800 entries. The overall ratio thus is "old style" ≈ 2100 = 36 %, "new style" ≈ 3750 = 64 %, total 5850 = 100 % in the whole period from 1911-1949.

In detail, this turned out as shown in table 4-2.

Table 4-2: Ratio of "old style" to "new style" categories of fiction (小说)

| year | 笔记小说/民国 | 传奇、话本、说唱小说等 (not 清 or older) | 章回小说/民国 | 其他旧小说 | 民国以来旧小说 | 新体小说 | ratio old:new |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1914 | 7 | 1 | 14 | 0 | **15** | 4 | 37:4 |
| 1917 | 9 | 0 | 19 | 0 | **30** | 1 | 58:1 |
| 1920 | 10 | 0 | 13 | 0 | **15** | 4 | 38:4 |
| 1923 | 8 | 1 | **15** | 0 | 13 | 20 | 37:20 |
| 1926 | 6 | 1 | 24 | 1 | **25** | 46 | 57:46 |
| 1930 | 7 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 2 | **142** | 37:142 |
| 1934 | 15 | 4 | 26 | 2 | 6 | **80** | 53:80 |
| 1938 | 2 | 1 | **5** | 0 | 2 | 7 | 10:7 |
| 1942 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | **90** | 12:90 |
| 1946 | 2 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 4 | **154** | 29:154 |

The fields marked in grey show the category the samples were selected from in the usual way (last entry of first, second, third third).

Regarding period IV, the *Quanguo zongshumu* of 1970 does not list the category *fiction* at all, so that in this case the titles were selected from *works of literature and art /* *revolutionary stories* (文艺作品 / 革命故事) instead.

### 4.3.2.5   Translations

The reason for adding translations is that contact, and especially contact via translations from Japanese, English, French, German, Russian, supposedly triggered certain grammatical changes.

In the case of translations, two different approaches were applied in selecting samples. The first was the same as for the sampling of the originally Chinese registers: taking all translations as a whole, dividing them by three and selecting the last entries of the first, second and third third. This approach works quite well with lists of mixed original languages, as found in the *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue zongshumu*, but is questionable with sources like the *Quanguo zongshumu*, where the entries of translated narrative prose are sorted by country of origin. The method of selecting the last entries of the three thirds would only result in ending up in more or less the same geographical area each time, and in ignoring percentages and proportions.

The other approach, applied to sampling from *Quanguo zongshumu*, was much more informative (though rather time-consuming). In this case it was necessary to count the number of entries of each original language and determine their percentage, to select in the second step (this time randomly) from the three largest groups of countries of origin. For illustration I would like to cite one part of the working process record:

> Source: Li, Paoguang 李泡光 (ed. / 主任) (1986): 全国总书目 1983
>
> Quanguo zongshumu 1983. Beijing 北京: Zhonghua shuju 中华书局
>
> Categories 文学 / 亚洲各国文学、非洲各国文学、欧洲各国文学、澳大利亚文学、美洲各国文学 are subdivided by country; the next subdivision is marked only by asterisks but not named. Try to find all entries of narrative prose.
>
> Count all entries, sum, select. 日本文学 [Japanese literature] 24 entries (p.368-370). 印度文学 [Indian literature] 11 entries (p.371f.). 亚洲其他各国文学, 15 entries (specification: none 5, Indonesia 2, Turkey 2, Korea 2, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Syria) (p.372f.). 非洲各国文学 [African

literature], 13 entries, (specification: none 3, Egypt 4, Zaire 2, Tansania 2, Guinea, Senegal, Sudan) (p.373f.). 欧洲各国文学 / 苏联文学 [European / Soviet literature], 81 entries (novels, narrating prose, short stories?) (p.376-382). 德国文学 [German literature], 12 entries (DDR 9, BRD 3) (p.383f.). 英国文学 [British literature], 49 entries (p.385-389). 法国文学 [French literature] 44 entries (p.390-394). 欧洲其他各国文学 [other European countries] Poland 7, Chechoslavakia 6, Hungary 2, Austria 3, Switzerland 4, Finland, Norway 2, Iceland 2, Romania 4, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece 5, Italy 3, Spain 5, Ireland 3, Holland, Belgium 2, none 3, total 55 entries (p.394-398). 澳洲文学 [Australian literature] 2 entries (p.398f.). 美洲各国文学 [American literature] Canada, USA 38, Latin America 3, Mexico, Brazil 2, Peru 2, Argentine, Chile, total 49 entries (p.399-403).

Total of translated literature: Asia 50, Africa 13, Europe (with SU) 241, Australia 2, America 49, total 355. (Asia 14%, Africa 3.7%, Europe without SU 45%, SU 22.8%, Australia 0.6%, America 13.8%).

Select one entry out of Europe without SU, one out of SU, one out of Asia, random selection, take the middle entry (Europe 12+49+44+55 = 160, half 80) no. 80 (somewhere in France)

三个火枪手 san ge huoqiangshou (Three Musketeers)。（法）大仲马 Da Zhongma (Dumas père) 原著，（英）M.格拉汉 Gelahan 缩写，吴铁安 Wu Tie'an 译。长沙：湖南人民出版社 1983.1。160 页，36 开。（世界文学名著〈缩写本〉丛书）(p.391)

Select one entry out of SU (81, half no.40)

生活正应该是这样（盖达尔的故事）shenghuo zheng yinggai shi zheyang (Gaida'er de gushi)。（苏）弗．玛留金 F. Maliujin 着，甘雨泽 Gan Yuze 译，赵廷春插图。哈尔滨：黑龙江人民出版社 1983.6。123 页，32 开。（外国名作家童年）(p.379)

Select one entry out of Asia (50, half no.25, India)

一串项练 yi chuan xianglian。（印度）普列姆昌德 Puliemuchangde 着，

庄重 Zhuang Zhong/Chong 译。太原：山西人民出版社 1983.11。361

页，大 32 开。(p.371)

Depending on the structure of the different bibliographies, the problem sometimes consisted in identifying the entries of translated texts and separating them from those originally written in Chinese. While the translations are grouped together in the *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue zongshumu* and the *Quanguo zongshumu*, this is not the case in the *Minguo shiqi zongshumu (1911-1949)*. In the latter case I collected all entries where an original nationality (presumably of the original author) is given in brackets, or where the author's name or the title of the work are foreign (= in alphabetic writing, either Latin or Russian letters). The addition of 译 (translator) or 编译 (translator-editor) after the Chinese author's name did not suffice, if the original language was not given. The additional problem of discontinuous translations arouse especially in the originally intended category "academic prose: sociology", that was later substituted by "academic prose: spoken and written language" (see 3.2.1): There is a huge number of translations in academic prose/social sciences in the 1920ies and even 1930ies, but none in the 1940ies and very little in period IV.

### 4.3.2.6  *Textbooks*

The next category following narrative prose translated is textbooks, represented by readers used in Chinese language classes in primary school and textbooks for history classes in middle school. The reasons to include textbooks are, as mentioned in 3.1.1, both their assumed high degree in the use of standardized language and their impact on a large number of readers.

The readers carry in their titles 国文 (*Guowen*, 1914-1920), 国语 (*Guoyu*, 1913 and 1920-1952) and 语文 (*Yuwen*, since 1952), thus illustrating the process of language change and change of standards stretching through this study.

For the textbooks listed by the bibliographies *Minguo shiqi zongshumu (1911-1949)* and *Renmin jiaoyu chubanshe shumu 1950-1999*, the usual method of selecting the last entry

of the first, second and third third had to be altered to reach comparability of the textbook level. To avoid comparing the language of first year readers to that of sixth or seventh year readers, it was decided to include only the first volumes of readers with the specification 高等小学, 高级小学 or 高小 (senior or higher primary school) for periods II and III. The junior primary school (初级小学) comprised four years since 1912, the senior primary school two to three years, so the first year of senior primary (高小) was the fifth year altogether. In period IV the designation *senior primary* vanishes after the 1950ies, so that for the years afterwards the fifth year volumes of the *Yuwen* –readers form the population.

The next criterion for selecting was then the publication year. Here it shows that textbooks were by no means published evenly throughout the years. There were, for example, many new publications of readers in the years following the 1912 reform of the educational system, but none in or around the years 1920 and 1923. As there are altogether comparatively few readers, it was not possible to fill the gaps with editions from neighbouring years. They stay open for the time being.

The third criterion was meant to be random selection, only that due to the scarcity of publications in most years there were not enough titles in the pool to allow for this approach. If there were only three or less, I included all titles.

The selection method used on history readers was the same. Here textbooks for Chinese history were considered for the sake of comparability. The second criterion was the publication year again, the third random selection, if the number of candidates exceeded three.

### 4.3.2.7   *News reportage*

For this register it was decided to cut by half the number of characters per sample, to account for the smaller average number of characters in newspaper texts, and to collect twice as many samples instead – from two newspapers rather than only one per preselected year. These two newspapers are the *Shenbao* 申報 and *Da Gongbao* 大公報 for periods I-III until 1949, the *Renmin Ribao* 人民日报 and *Guangming Ribao* 光明日

报 for periods IV and V since 1949, one of them as the more official, the other as the more intellectual organ.

Analogous to the method used for the other registers of cutting the sample from the middle of a text, the newspaper sample should be taken from the more or less first edition of the second half of the year.[53]

The sample then should belong to the international and regional news categories (if existent, otherwise page 3 or 4) and contain 2,500 to 2,600 characters.

### *4.3.2.8 Academic prose*

This register was the one that involved most difficulties, as it turned out during the compilation process that the original choice of the bibliographical category "social sciences: sociology" was a rather unlucky one, as was mentioned already in 3.2.1 and 3.2.5 In the end, it was substituted by "spoken and written language" (语言文字 / 汉语 与汉字).

The reasons for these difficulties are that there are hardly any publications in the category "social sciences: sociology" before the 1920ies, no translations in this category in the 1940ies, and after 1949 this category showed some tendency to dissolve: in 1950, 1956 it is called "Social sciences, political sciences", with the "social sciences" part almost entirely consisting of communist parties' histories. In 1962, there is no "social sciences" but only "politics and social life", in 1970 and 1973 only "politics", in 1978 the "social sciences" return with one page of general introductions, and only in 1983 does the category "social sciences: sociology" return.

Whereas the category of "academic prose: language, originally Chinese" can be satisfactorily filled, this does not apply as easily for the translations into Chinese. The approach will be the same as with the other translations selected from "Minguo shiqi zong shumu", meaning that all the entries in some way marked as translations (either by country of origin or by name of author given in original language) form one pool, sorted

---

[53]    Here, July 15th turned out to be the better choice than July 1st, when the birthday of the Chinese Communist Party is celebrated on all pages of the *Renmin Ribao*.

by the according years, and that the samples will be chosen in the usual way from this pool.

# 5 The Examples

This chapter is dedicated to listing and sorting the diverse statements concerning the degree, tendency, and partly motivation of linguistic change in written Chinese that have been made by the authors introduced in chapter 3. The sorting in this chapter does not necessarily follow the original order applied by the different authors on 'Europeanization' in their publications, but tries to class the phenomena according to their place in grammatical analysis from morphology through syntax to semantics. As some of these examples belong to more than one level or in their different aspects to different levels, there is some overlapping. The last part is dedicated to orthographical 'Europeanization': instances of "Europeanized" usage only visible in the written form.

## 5.1  Morphology

Morphology is translated into Chinese as *xíngtàixué* 形态学 or *cífǎxué* 词法学. The former is sometimes associated with "Western grammar",[54] or with "studying the grammatical form of words" in a narrower sense as opposed to "the grammatical structure, including the grammatical form".[55] The latter, *cífǎxué* 词法学, is both seen as "opposite to syntax (*jùfǎxué* 句法学)" (Qi 1993: 279) and "often not distinguished from syntax" (Feng 1997: 89).[56] It is concerned with the structure of words and word formation as well as with the freedom or boundedness of morphemes.

To this level belong the structures that Wang Li presents in the very first section (sect. 41) of his two chapters on Europeanized grammar, entitled 'The creation of disyllabic words (*fùyīncí de chuàngzào* 复音词的创造)', the word formation affixes, the plural

---

[54] "形态学：即 morphology. 西洋语法学的部门之一，研究词的形态问题。" Feng 1997: 607.

[55] "前者研究词的语法形式，后者研究词的语法结构，包括词的语法形式（形态）和语法意义。" Qi 1993: 243.

[56] Nor are morphology and syntax distinguished in generative transformational grammar. See Qi 1993: 279.

marker -*men*, the progressive aspect marker -*zhe* and newly composed disyllabic coverbs.

## 5.1.1 Disyllabization

The increase in the number of disyllabic words in Europeanized Chinese, compared to their number in Classical Chinese or in Modern Chinese, is the starting point of Wang Li's discussion on Europeanized grammar. Although he acknowledges that there had been disyllabic words at all times, he holds that their ratio was approximately 1 : 3 : 9 in old, modern, and contemporary times (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 335). At the same time, he assumes that disyllabization has its limits, as not every word in Chinese could become disyllabic, at least not in the spoken language (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 340).

According to Wang Li, the creation of disyllabic words belongs to two levels: regarding the semantic aspect, to a 'Europeanization of the lexicon, regarding the phonetic aspect, to a 'Europeanization' of grammar (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 436) - 'phonetic' obviously including morphology. After giving a few examples of disyllabic words in Classical Chinese, he lists modern translations of Western words using the old method of "reduplication of meaning" [57] (*yìfùfǎ* 意复法), like "society *shèhuì* 社会", "happy *xìngfú* 幸福", "consider *kǎolǜ* 考虑" etc. The limitations of this method he sees in words that do not have a synonym. As another method of creating disyllabic words he mentions "periphrasis" (*guǎiwānfǎ* 拐弯法), applied where a single Western word is translated by a "*lèyǔ* 仂语"[58] in Chinese, like "animal *dòngwù* 动物", "absolute *juéduì* 绝对", "improve *gǎishàn/gǎiliáng* 改善/改良" etc. The peculiarities produced by this periphrastic method are (1) repetition of words (or rather of morphemes)[59] and (2) the

---

[57]   The English terms in quotation marks are translations by Wang Li.

[58]   仂语 *lèyǔ* sometimes refers to *duǎnyǔ* 短语, which would be "phrase" in English, e.g. in *Yǔyánxué bǎikē cídiǎn* (1993: 65), but is used in a different meaning by Wang Li: *lèyǔ* is a composite of two or more content words forming a complex semantic unit. Though principally equal to the use of a word, the criterion for distinguishing *lèyǔ* and word is the insertion test: if it is possible to insert another character [morpheme], then it is a *lèyǔ*, if not, it is a word (Feng 1997: 365f.).

[59]   The examples he gives include *Yínháng de hángzhǎng* 银行的行长 - bank manager, where '*háng*' 行 is repeated, *zhùmíng zuòjiā de zuòpǐn* 著名作家的作品 - the famous author's works, where '*zuò*' 作 is repeated, *xuésheng jìn xuéxiào* 学生进学校 - students enter the school, where '*xué*' 学 is repeated,

phenomenon that seemingly incomprehensible Chinese becomes comprehensible when translated into 'Western' [sic: *Xīwén* 西文[60]] (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 438). As a third method he mentions "transliteration" (*yīnyìfǎ* 音译法), with the qualification that "China does not like to walk the road of transliteration",[61] although there were many transliterations in Cantonese. Disyllabic translated terms (*yìmíng* 译名) of Sino-Japanese and of autochthonous Chinese origin are treated jointly, as both use Chinese characters and frequently the method of "periphrasis", albeit there are some exceptions. In the end, he remarks that "judging from this, the Chinese language since the Europeanization has in a certain sense lost its qualification as a monosyllabic language."[62]

In 1959, the authors from Beijing Normal University observe for the time between 1898 and 1911 that there were two antagonistic tendencies in Chinese concerning the question of mono-, di- or polysyllabicity, one of them towards polysyllabization, influenced by translations (either in the way of phonetic transcription or of semantic translation), the other towards arbitrarily abbreviating words to make them fit into parallelisms and antitheses, influenced by *wényán* style and leading to a high degree of instability in syllabicity (Beijing Normal University 1959: 90).

Also Li Chi observes, in opposition to Wang Lis assessment, the tendency to monosyllables and a revival of idiomatic four-character-expressions in the language of propagandistic slogans.[63] Nonetheless, she names a large number of disyllabic words of different provenance and motivation: direct translations from foreign languages – with combinations of sound and meaning translations having more chances of surviving in

---

or *értóng kàn tónghuà* 儿童看童话 - children read fairy tales, where '*tóng*' 童 is repeated (*Yufa lilun* 1984: 438).

[60]   Benjamin Lee Whorf summarized European languages like English, German, French, in a similar way when he contrasted American Indian languages to a "Standard Average European" (SAE). The term SAE was coined in the late 1930ies.

[61]   '中国是不大喜欢走音译的路的。' *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 440. The English terms in quotation marks are translations by Wang Li.

[62]   '由此看来，中国语自从欧化之后，由某一意义说，它已经失了单音语的资格了。' *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 442.

[63]   Chapters 3 and 4 of the first part "Development in Word-Composition" of her study *New Features in Chinese Grammatical Usage* (1962), pp. 27-38.

the vocabulary compared to pure transliterations –, adoptions from Japan (frequently taken from Chinese classics originally and fitted to foreign terms)[64] and the results of "the desire to prove to the world that modern Chinese is not a monosyllabic language" (Li Chi 1962: 12). Examples of these last efforts not only in written, but also in spoken Chinese are *měilì* 美丽 instead of *měi* 美, *měihǎo* 美好 instead of *hǎo* 好 (especially in propaganda), or *shǐyòng* 使用 instead of *yòng* 用. As method of word composition for the greatest number of disyllabic nouns, adjectives and verbs by far, she names juxtaposition of two morphemes of similar meaning (Wang Lis *yìfùfǎ* 意复法), as another popular method of word composition subordinate constructions, which in the case of verbs often have to be translated as phrases into English.

## 5.1.2  Word formation affixes

The word formation affixes do not appear in Wang Lis section 41 on "Creation of disyllabic words", but in section 44 as markers. The authors of Beijing Normal University mention them in the second part of the book, on lexical innovations, in the chapter on the development of word formation, and see a tendency towards affixation since May Fourth. Li Chi also treats them as a case of word composition, C. Kubler as "morphological influence", seeing also a "large number of new, Europeanized morphological elements" (Kubler 1985: 70), E. Gunn simply as one of the "Euro-Japanese features in grammar and rhetoric prior to 1918" bordering on lexicography, and Xie Yaoji in his part on word formation, whereas A. Peyraube does not mention this type of affixes at all, presumably because they should be classed as belonging to the field of lexical change, which, being undoubtedly influenced by European and Japanese languages, he leaves out in his article. Table 5-1 shows an overview of all affixes discussed by the different authors.

---

[64]  Li Chi writes: "It is true that some of the terms, like chen-li [真理 (truth)], tzu-yu [自由 (freedom)], ko-ming [革命 (revolution)], feng-chien [封建 (feudalism)], hsin-yung [信用 (trust, credit)] and chi-hua [計畫 (project, plan)] are bodily taken from Chinese classics, mostly by Japanese, and fitted to foreign terms, but the new meaning they bear and the new currency they have received have transformed them into new words." (Li 1962: 11) The characters for these words and their English translations are taken from the same paragraph, preceding sentence.

## Table 5-1: Affixes at a glance

| author / affix | Wang Li *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* | Wang Li *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* | Beijing Normal Univ. | Li Chi | C. Kubler | E. Gunn | Xie Yaoji |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 阿 *ā-* | | | | X | | | |
| 超 *-chāo* | | | X | | | X | |
| 点 *-diǎn* | | | | | | X | |
| 度 *-dù* | X | X | | X | X | | |
| 法 *-fǎ* | | | | | | X | |
| 反 *fǎn-* | | | X | | X | X | X |
| 汎 *fàn-* | | | X | | | | |
| 非 *fēi-* | | | X | | X | X | |
| 副 *fú-* | | | | | X | | |
| 观 *-guān* | | | | | | X | |
| 化 *-huà* | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 家 *-jiā* | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 界 *-jiè* | | | | | | X | |
| 力 *-lì* | | | | | | X | |
| 率 *-lǜ* | | | | | | X | |
| 论 *-lùn* | | | | | | X | |
| 品 *-pǐn* | X | X | | X | X | | |
| 人 *-rén* | X | | | X | | | |
| 师 *-shī* | | | X | | | X | X |
| 式 *-shì* | | | | | | X | |
| 手 *-shǒu* | | | X | X | | X | |
| 性 *-xìng* | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 学 *-xué* | | | | | | X | |
| 员 *-yuán* | X | | X | X | | X | X |
| 者 *-zhě* | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 主义 *-zhǔyì* | | | X | | X | | X |

In the following, I will list these affixes by author and, for easier comparability, in alphabetic order. I will also for each affix add three of the author's examples, if he or she gives any.

**Wang Li, *Zhōngguó xiàndài yǔfǎ* (pp. 356-58) and *Zhōngguó yǔfǎ lǐlùn* (pp. 466-68), 1944:**

度 *-dù* "-th" (as in "length") - *chángdù* 长度 'length', *shēndù* 深度 'depth', *qiángdù* 强度 'strength'

化 *-huà* "-ize", one of the newest markers - *biāozhǔnhuà* 标准化 'standardize', *lǐxiǎnghuà* 理想化 'idealize', *pǔbiànhuà* 普遍化 'generalize'

家 *-jiā* "-ist, -ian" ("-er" only in *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn*), one of the oldest markers - *xīnlǐxuéjiā* 心理学家 'psychologist', *tiānwénxuéjiā* 天文学家 'astronomer', *yìshùjiā* 艺术家 'artist'

品 *-pǐn* no English suffix, but in combination with a verb used to translate English
. nouns - *zuòpǐn* 作品 'work', *shípǐn* 食品 'food', *chūpǐn* 出品 'product' or 'production'[65]

人 *-rén* and 员 *-yuán* sometimes used instead of 者 (only in *Xiàndài yǔfǎ*)
- *fāyánrén* 发言人 'speaker', *yǎnyuán* 演员 'player'

性 *-xìng* "-ity, -ce, -ness", one of the newest markers - *kěnéngxìng* 可能性 'possibility', *zhòngyàoxìng* 重要性 'importance', *shénmìxìng* 神秘性 'mysteriousness'

者 *-zhě* "-er, -or", one of the oldest markers - *zuòzhě* 作者 'author', *dúzhě* 读者 'reader', *gōngzuòzhě* 工作者 'worker'

**Beijing Normal university, *Wǔ sì yǐlái Hànyǔ shūmiàn yǔyán*, 1959, pp. 108-115:**

超 *chāo-* after adopting Japanese translations, it was used to translate Indo-European prefixes like English "super-" (same in French and German), Russian "пере-" or "сверх-" etc. The following examples emerged around May Fourth - *chāoyīnbō* 超音波 'ultrasonic wave', *chāoyīnsù* 超音速 'supersonic speed', *chāoxiànshí-*

---

[65]  Different translations: in *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 357 as 'product', in *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 467 as 'production'.

*zhǔyì* 超现实主义 'surrealism'

反 *fǎn-* after adopting Japanese translations, it was used to translate Indo-European prefixes like English "anti-" (same in French and German) or "counter-" (French "conter-" [contre-, R.C.]), Russian "анти-" etc. Emerged after May Fourth, e.g. *fǎndì* 反帝 'anti-imperialist', *fǎnsū* 反苏 'anti-soviet', *fǎngòng* 反共 'anticommunist/anticommunism'. Used only after May Fourth.

汎 *fàn-*, also written 泛, phonetic transcription as well as semantic translation. After adopting Japanese translations used to translate Indo-European prefixes like English "pan-" (same in French and German), Russian "пан-" etc. Emerged around May Fourth, e.g. *fànshénjiào* 汎神教 'pantheism', *fàn'ōuliánméng* 汎欧联盟 'paneuropean union', *fàntǔ'ěrqízhǔyì* 汎土耳其主义 'panturkism'

非 *fēi-* in Old Chinese (*Gǔ Hànyǔ* 古汉语) as copula with similar construction, in Japanese translations, influencing Chinese very strongly. Later used to translate Indo-European prefixes like English "non-" or "anti-" (same in French and German), Russian "не-" etc. Between 1898 and 1911 appeared e.g. *fēiwù* 非物 'immaterial', *fēizhuǎnyèzhě* 非专业者 'amateur', *fēijīnshǔ* 非金属 'nonmetal', after May 4th e.g. *fēizhèngshì* 非正式 'inofficial', *fēituányuán* 非团员 'non-member', *fēizāiqū* 非灾区 'non-disaster area'

化 *-huà* first in Japanese, later adopted into Chinese, very seldom before May Fourth, used for translating Indo-European suffixes like English "-ization" or "-ize", French "-isation" or "-iser", German "-isierung" or "-isieren", Russian "-зация" etc. Between 1898 and 1911 appeared e.g. *réngéhuà* 人格化 'personification/personify', *tónghuà* 同化 'assimilation/assimilate', *yìhuà* 异化 'alienation/dissimilation', after May Fourth e.g. *ōuhuà* 欧化 'Europeanization/europeanize', *jūnshìhuà* 军事化 'militarize', *gōngyèhuà* 工业化 'industrialization/industrialize'

家 *-jiā* in Old Chinese, in Japanese translations, influencing Chinese very strongly. Also used for translating Indo-European suffixes denoting humans. Between 1898 and 1911 appeared e.g. *zhènglùnjiā* 政論家 'political

commentator', *wàijiāojiā* 外交家 'diplomat', *sīxiǎngjiā* 思想家 'thinker', after

May Fourth e.g. *mànhuàjiā* 漫画家 'caricaturist', *hángkōngjiā* 航空家 'aviator',

*jùzuòjiā* 剧作家 'playwright'

师 *-shī* used in Old Chinese, in Japanese translations, can be used for translating

Indo-European suffixes denoting humans. Between 1898 and 1911 appeared

e.g. *gōngchéngshī* 工程师 'engineer', *jiàoshī* 教师 'teacher', *mùshi* 牧师

'pastor', after May Fourth e.g. *jīshī* 机师 'engineer', *chúshī* 厨师 'cook',

*nóngyìshī* 农艺师 'agronomist'

手 *-shǒu* used in Old Chinese, in Japanese translations, and for translating Indo-

European suffixes denoting humans. Already in use between 1898 and 1911;

after May Fourth e.g. *qíshǒu* 旗手 'standard-bearer', *jīqiāngshǒu* 机枪手

'machine gunner', *tuōlājīshǒu* 拖拉机手 'tractor driver'

性 *-xìng* first in Japanese, later adopted into Chinese, used for translating Indo-

European suffixes like English "-ty", French "-it" ["-(i)té"?], German "-keit" or

"-ität" etc., Russian "-ость" etc. Between 1898 and 1911 appeared e.g. *núlìxìng*

奴隶性 'slavish/slavishness', *hòutiānxìng* 后天性 'posteriority', *dúlìxìng* 独立

性 'independence', after May Fourth e.g. *jiējíxìng* 阶级性 'class character',

*qúnzhòngxìng* 群众性 'mass character', *yìshùxìng* 艺术性 'artistic quality'

員 *-yuán* used as morpheme/lexeme in some words in Old Chinese, in Japanese

translations which influenced Chinese very strongly. Also used for translating

Indo-European suffixes denoting humans. Between 1898 and 1911 appeared

e.g. *dǎngyuán* 党員 'party member', *zhíyuán* 职員 'office worker', *jiāoshèyuán*

交涉員 'negotiator', after May Fourth e.g. *tuányuán* 团員 'member (of a

delegation etc.)', *duìyuán* 队員 'team member', *shèyuán* 社員 'commune

member'

者 *-zhě* a pronoun in Old Chinese, in Old Chinese there were already similar structures,

frequently in Japanese translations, used for translating Indo-European suffixes

denoting humans. Between 1898 and 1911 appeared e.g. *jìzhě* 記者 'reporter',

*láodòngzhě* 劳动者 'labourer', *shèhuìzhǔyìzhě* 社会主义者 'socialist', after May

Fourth *gānshèzhě* 干涉者'meddler', *gōngzuòzhě* 工作者 'worker', *wúchǎnzhě* 无产者'proletarian'

主义 *-zhǔyì* first in Japanese, later adopted into Chinese, used for translating Indo-European suffixes like English "-ism", French "-isme", German "-ismus", Russian "-изм" etc. Between 1898 and 1911 appeared e.g. *shèhuìzhǔyì* 社会主义'socialism', *dìguózhǔyì* 帝国主义'imperialism', *gèrénzhǔyì* 个人主义 'individualism', after May Fourth e.g. *guójìzhǔyì* 国际主义'internationalism', *jítǐzhǔyì* 集体主义'collectivism', *xiànshízhǔyì* 现实主义'realism'

As further examples for word formating elements with tendency to suffixation are listed "阶级 *jiējí* 'class', 分子 *fēnzi* 'element', 式 *shì* 'form', 型 *xíng* 'type', 力 *lì* 'power', 度 *dù* 'degree', 品 *pǐn* 'product', 派 *pài* 'faction' etc"., as word formating elements with tendency to prefixation "半 *bàn* 'half', 亲 *qīn* 'kin' etc. ", but without giving their origin and history and adding only one example each.

**Li Chi, *New Features*, 1962, pp. 20-27:**

阿 *ā-* dialectal influence on standard common language - *āyí* 阿姨 (honorific term of address for young women by children)

度 *-dù* (listed, but not discussed)

化 *-huà* "-ize, -ization", as counterpart of the English "-ize" and "-ization" one of the newest suffixes - *lǜhuà* 綠化'verdancize', *jiǎnhuà* 簡化'simplify', *tōngsúhuà* 通俗化'popularize'

家 *-jiā* one of the oldest suffixes, invests meaning of mastery, special training - *wàijiāojiā* 外交家'diplomat', *jūnshìjiā* 軍事家'strategist', *kēxuéjiā* 科學家 'scientist'

品 *-pǐn* (listed, but not discussed)

人 *-rén* old suffix, indicating the man whose situation or work is described by what goes before it, in recent development chiefly used in legal and some political terms - *dāngshìrén* 當事人'the party concerned', *lǐngdǎorén* 領導人'leaders',

*gémìng lăorén* 革命老人 'old men of the revolution period'

手 *-shŏu* connected with physical skill, nowadays replacing terms formerly ending in 的 *de* and ranking slightly above 員 *yuán* - *gēshŏu* 歌手 'one who sings', *bànhéshŏu* 扮禾手 'reaper', *chāyāngshŏu* 插秧手 'sower'

性 *-xìng* one of the newest suffixes, used for all abstract nouns and adjectives, even phrases - *kěnéngxìng* 可能性 'possibility', *shíjiānxìng* 時間性 'time element', *bù kě zhànshèng xìng* 不可戰勝性 'invulnerability'

員 *-yuán* changed from neutral kind of suffix to one that indicates lower rank (with the exception 委員) - *shìwùyuán* 事務員 'administrative clerk', *zhíyuán* 職員 'clerks, officers', *wěiyuán* 委員 'committee member'[66]

者 *-zhě* neutral suffix, one of the oldest, retains its literary flavor - *dìguózhǔyìzhě* 帝國主者 'imperialists', *xiānxíngzhě* 先行者 'forerunner', *qīnlüèzhě* 侵略者 'invaders'

老 *lăo* before 1959 after the name (X 老), nowadays [1962] also in front of it as term of intimate address

**C. Kubler, *A Study of Europeanized Grammar*, 1985, pp. 70-73:**

反 *făn-* 'anti-'
非 *fēi-* 'non-'
副 *fú-* 'vice-'
度 *-dù* 'degree of'
化 *-huà* '-ize, -ify', present use influenced by Western languages - *jùtǐhuà* 'make concrete, concretize',
家 *-jiā* '-ist'

---

[66] Li Chi added that many of the terms used for professions had formerly been rather loosely constructed nominal phrases using the structural particle *de* 的 and generally omitting the head, whereas the terms using *yuán* 员/員 are words "formed according to the regular rules of word composition, and its use enhances precision in expression, which is one of the goals set up by contemporary language policy makers. " (Li Chi 1962: 23f.).

品 -*pǐn* 'goods' - *shēchǐpǐn* 'luxury articles' [no characters given], *xīshēngpǐn* 'things to be sacrificed, sacrifice'

性 -*xìng* '-ic, -tion, -ty, -ness', used to form attributives or abstract nouns - *miáoxiěxìng* 'descriptive', *shàndòngxìng* 'flaming instigation', *kěnéngxìng* 'possibility'

者 -*zhě* '-er, -or', originally a *wényán* particle, recently translating Western nouns ending in -er and -or - *zuòzhě* 'writer', *bōzhǒngzhě* 'sower of seed', *réndàozhǔyìzhě* 'humanitarian'

主义 -*zhǔyì* '-ism'

**E. Gunn, *Rewriting Chinese*, 1991, pp. 218-19:**

Prefixes forming new terms from Japanese

超 *chāo-*

非 *fēi-*

反 *fǎn-*

Suffixes

點 -*diǎn*

法 -*fǎ*

觀 -*guān*

化 -*huà*

家 -*jiā*

界 -*jiè*

力 -*lì*

率 -*lǜ*

論 -*lùn*

式 -*shì*

性 -*xìng*

學 -*xué*

員 –*yuán*

Suffixes already extant in Chinese, reintroduced together with Japanese neologisms

師 -*shī*

手 -*shǒu*

者 -*zhě*

**Xie Yaoji, "Hànyǔ yǔfǎ Ōuhuà zǒngshù", 2001, p. 18:**

反 *fǎn*- usage like English "counter-, anti-"

化 -*huà* "-ize, -ise"

性 -*xìng* "-ty, -cy, -ship, -hood, -ness"

主义 -*zhǔyì* "-ism"

Affixes previously existing in Chinese, all used like English "-er, -ian, -ist, -or, -eer"

家 -*jiā*

师 -*shī*

员 -*yuán*

者 -*zhě*

All in all, the affixes listed by the different authors from Wang Li to Xie Yaoji amount to 5 prefixes and 21 suffixes. As nearly all of these also appear as free or bound morphemes in other functions, a simple count is little significant, particularly as the most interesting part are the collocations.

**Word formation affixes in the corpus texts**

To be able to collect these collocations, it was necessary to limit the scope to one prefix and three suffixes. I will give either all or, if exceeding ten, the ten most frequent types with the affix in question that translate in the way that is given by the authors above.

**Table 5-2: Prefix *fǎn-* 反 'anti-', 'counter-'**

All tokens of *fǎn* 反 regardless of meaning, by period and register:

| | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* |
| Period I | 10 | *3.3* | 8 | *1.6* | -- | -- | 13 | *2.9* | 31 | *2.5* |
| Period II | 15 | *3.0* | 4 | *0.8* | 21 | *5.3* | 14 | *3.1* | 54 | *2.9* |
| Period III | 10 | *2.0* | 4 | *0.8* | 6 | *1.2* | 18 | *3.6* | 38 | *1.9* |
| Period IV | 21 | *5.3* | 4 | *1.0* | 13 | *4.3* | 68 | *13.6* | 106 | *6.6* |
| Period V | 21 | *5.3* | 7 | *1.4* | 25 | *5.0* | 24 | *4.8* | 80 | *4.2* |
| **in all** | **77** | ***3.7*** | **27** | ***1.1*** | **65** | ***3.8*** | **140** | ***5.8*** | **309** | ***3.6*** |

Types with *fǎn* 反 translating 'anti-' or 'counter-':

*fǎn gémìng* 反革命 'counterrevolutionary': 19 tokens 1956-1974

> IV: 4 in "narrative prose Chinese", 3 in "essays", 12 in "newspaper"

*fǎn gōng* 反攻 'counterattack': 10 tokens 1930-1978

> III: 2 in "essays", 6 in "newspaper"

> IV: 1 in "narrative prose Chinese"

> V: 1 in "essays"

*fǎn gǎn* 反感 'dislike', 'antipathy': 7 tokens 1930-1988

> III: 1 in "narrative prose translated"

> V: 2 in "narrative prose Chinese", 2 in "narrative prose translated",
>  2 in "essays"

*fǎn zhǒngzúzhǔyì* 反种族主义 'anti-racism': 2 tokens 1988

> V: 2 in "newspaper"

*fǎn qīnlüè (zhànzhēng)* 反侵略(战争) 'anti-aggression (war)': 1 token 1946

> III: 1 in "essays"

*fǎn dìguózhǔyì* 反帝国主义 'anti-imperialism': 1 token 1950

> IV: 1 in "newspaper"

*fǎn dì* 反帝 (short form of former): 1 token 1950

IV: 1 in "newspaper"

*fǎn jī* 反击 'counterattack': 1 token 1978

V: 1 in "essays"

*fǎn zhǒngzúgélí* 反种族隔离 'anti-apartheid': 1 token 1988

V: 1 in "newspaper"

Of these 43 tokens, 23 appear in "newspaper", 10 in "essays", 7 in "narrative prose Chinese" and only 3 in "essays"; 10 appear in period III, 22 in period IV, and 11 in period V.

The most frequent word starting with *fǎn* 反, nevertheless, is *fǎnduì* 反对 'oppose' with 67 tokens between 1905 and 1999. There are many more words starting with *fǎn-* 反 to be found in the corpus texts, like *fǎndòng* 反动 'reactionary', 'reaction' (20 tokens 1909-1978), *fǎnyìng* 反映 'reflect' (19 tokens 1923-1998), *fǎnfù* 反复 'repeatedly', 'reversal' (14 tokens 1914-1999), which translate with the Latin prefix 're-', and some more that translate differently, like *fǎnzhèng* 反正 'anyway', 'since' (11 tokens 1946-1999, plus 2 tokens 1978-1983 meaning 'return to rectitude'), *fǎndào* 反倒 'on the contrary, instead' (4 tokens 1956-1999), or *fǎncè* 反侧 'rebellious', 'unsettled' (2 tokens 1911-1983).

Apart from the fact that the morpheme *fǎn* 反 in its meaning 'turn' or 'counter' has been in use for quite a long time, its usage did indeed increase during periods II and IV, whereas in periods III and V it decreased. The earliest occurrence of *fǎn* 反 as 'anti' in texts of this corpus is in 1930, far after May Fourth - supporting the authors from Beijing Normal University. The period when *fǎn* 反 was most frequently used is period IV, the time of Maoist ideology, and the register in which it was used most frequently is "newspaper". For comparison: in the Manifesto of the Communist Party by Marx and Engels occur 14.5 instances of *fǎn* 反 per 5,000 characters, thereof 7.3 as *fǎnduì* 反对.

It should also be noted that *pīnyīn*-orthography treats *fǎn* 反 mostly as separate verb followed by its object, forming a VO-group, whereas the European translations are either written as one word or hyphenated.

**Table 5-3: Suffix -*huà* 化 '-ize', '-ization', '-ify'**

All tokens of -*huà* 化 regardless of meaning, by period and register:

| | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* |
| Period I | 6 | *2.0* | 6 | *1.2* | -- | -- | 7 | *0.2* | 19 | *1.5* |
| Period II | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 32 | *8.0* | 9 | *2.0* | 51 | *2.8* |
| Period III | 8 | *1.6* | 5 | *1.0* | 60 | *12.0* | 10 | *2.0* | 83 | *4.2* |
| Period IV | 4 | *1.0* | 9 | *2.3* | 15 | *5.0* | 70 | *14.0* | 98 | *6.1* |
| Period V | 9 | *2.3* | 3 | *0.6* | 20 | *4.0* | 55 | *11.0* | 87 | *4.6* |
| **in all** | **28** | *1.3* | **32** | *1.3* | **127** | *7.5* | **151** | **6.3** | **338** | **3.9** |

The ten most frequent types out of 25 in the corpus where the suffix -*hua* 化 translates '-ize', '-ization', '-ify' are:

*gémìnghuà* 革命化 'revolutionize': 13 tokens 1968-1978

       IV: 12 in "newspaper"

       V: 1 in "newspaper"

*xiàndàihuà* 现代化 'modernize, modernization': 7 tokens 1956-1998

       IV: 1 in "newspaper"

       V: 6 in "newspaper"

*ōuhuà* 欧化 'europeanize, Europeanization': 7 tokens 1923 in "essay" (one sample) (II)

*sìhuà* 四化 (short form of *sì gè xiàndàihuà* 四个现代化 'four modernizations'):

       3 tokens 1983-1988 in "newspaper" (V)

*yōuhuà* 优化 'optimize, optimization': 3 tokens 1993 in "newspaper" (V)

*fǎzhìhuà* 法制化 'legal system-ize/ization': 3 tokens 1993 in "newspaper" (V)

*jìnghuà* 净化 'purify', 'purge': 2 tokens 1926-1934

       II: 1 in "narrative prose translated"

       III: 1 in "newspaper"

*duōyànghuà* 多样化 'diversify': 2 tokens 1956-1998

       IV: 1 in "newspaper"

V: 1 in "newspaper"

*héfǎhuà* 合法化'legalize, legitimize': 2 tokens 1962 in "newspaper" (IV)

*láodònghuà* 劳动化'laborization' (of intellectuals), 'integration with the working

people': 2 tokens 1968 in "newspaper" (IV)

Of these 44 tokens, 36 appear in "newspaper", 7 in one essay, and only 1 appears in "narrative prose translated"; 8 appear in period II, 1 in period III, 18 in period IV and 17 in period V.

Here again, *huà* 化'change' was long in use before any European linguistic influence, but it also proved to be very convenient to both translate the English morphemes '-ize', '-ization' and to make up new words once this became necessary. This type of words has obviously spread from "essays" of periods II and III to newspaper language of periods IV and V, it hardly appears in narrative prose. The earliest occurrence of *huà* 化 in this corpus translating '-ize' or '-ization' is *ōuhuà* 欧化'europeanize', 'Europeanization' - of all things -, it appears seven times in an Essay written by Zhou Zuoren in 1922. Again, this confirms different authors in stating that the suffix *-huà* 化 as '-ize', '-ization' is one of the newest and did not occur before May Fourth.

## Table 5-4: Suffix *-yuán* 员 '-er', '-or', '-ist'

All tokens of *-yuán* 员 regardless of meaning, by period and register:

| | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* |
| Period I | 1 | *0.3* | 2 | *0.4* | -- | -- | 63 | *14.0* | 66 | *5.3* |
| Period II | 1 | *0.2* | 1 | *0.2* | 15 | *3.8* | 60 | *13.3* | 77 | *4.2* |
| Period III | 21 | *4.2* | 3 | *0.6* | 11 | *2.2* | 46 | *9.2* | 81 | *4.1* |
| Period IV | 35 | *8.8* | 14 | *3.5* | 17 | *5.7* | 93 | *18.6* | 159 | *9.9* |
| Period V | 8 | *2.0* | 15 | *3.0* | 2 | *0.4* | 77 | *15.4* | 102 | *5.4* |
| **in all** | **66** | *3.1* | **35** | *1.5* | **45** | *2.6* | **339** | *14.1* | **485** | **5.6** |

The ten most frequent types out of 54 in the corpus with the suffix -*yuán* 员 are:

*wěiyuán* 委员 'committee member': 111 tokens 1900-1999

> I: 1 in "narrative prose Chinese", 7 in "newspaper"
>
> II: 5 in "newspaper"
>
> III: 20 in "newspaper"
>
> IV: 3 in "narrative prose Chinese", 41 in "newspaper"
>
> V: 5 in "narrative prose translated", 29 in "newspaper"

*rényuán* 人员 'personnel, staff': 65 tokens 1906-1999

> I: 6 in "newspaper"
>
> II: 4 in "newspaper"
>
> III: 5 in "newspaper"
>
> IV: 1 in "narrative prose Chinese", 1 in "narrative prose translated", 18 in "newspaper"
>
> V: 2 in "narrative prose Chinese", 1 in "narrative prose translated", 27 in "newspaper"

*yìyuán* 议员 'member of a legislative body': 33 tokens 1911-1938

> I: 1 in "newspaper"
>
> II: 27 in "newspaper"
>
> III: 5 in "newspaper"

*xuéyuán* 学员 'member of an institution of learning': 23 tokens 1906-1993

> I: 3 in "newspaper"
>
> IV: 14 in "newspaper"
>
> V: 6 in "newspaper"

*dǎngyuán* 党员 'party member': 20 tokens 1926-1993

> II: 1 in "newspaper"
>
> IV: 4 in "narrative prose translated", 3 in "essays", 1 in "newspaper"
>
> V: 11 in "newspaper"

*jiàoyuán* 教员 'teacher, instructor': 17 tokens 1920-1946

> II: 1 in "narrative prose Chinese", 1 in "newspaper"
>
> III: 14 in "narrative prose Chinese", 1 in "essays"

*chéngyuán* 成员 'member (group/family)': 15 tokens 1962-1993

> IV: 8 in "newspaper"

> V: 1 in "narrative prose Chinese", 6 in "newspaper"

*shèyuán* 社员 'commune member, member of a society': 8 tokens 1923-1974

> II: 1 in "newspaper"

> III: 1 in "narrative prose Chinese", 2 in "essays"

> IV: 1 in "narrative prose Chinese", 3 in "newspaper"

*cāozòngyuán* 操纵员 'operator, controller': 8 tokens 1973 in "narrative prose Chinese"

> (IV)

*géyuán* 阁员 'cabinett member': 8 tokens 1914-1923

> II: 5 in "essays", 3 in "newspaper"

Of these 308 tokens, 253 appear in "newspaper", 33 in "narrative prose Chinese", 11 in "narrative prose translated" and 11 in "essays"; 18 appear in period I, 48 in period II, 48 in period III, 106 in period IV and 88 in period V.

44 more types with the suffix *-yuán* 员 can be found in the corpus, half of them with only one token. Compared to the affixes *fǎn-* 反 and *-huà* 化, the disparity between the less formal registers narrative prose (both Chinese and translated) and "newspaper" is even more striking, with "essays" clearly tending to the informal registers. As for Li Chis observation that *yuán* "has changed from a neutral kind of suffix to one that indicates lower rank" (Li 1962: 23), this could be verified only by taking a close look into the esteem of different professional categories in the time their appellation was coined or current.

**Table 5-5: Suffix *-zhǔyì* 主义 '-ism'**

All tokens of *-zhǔyì* 主义 regardless of meaning, by period and register:

| | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* |
| Period I | 3 | *1.0* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 8 | *1.8* | 11 | *0.9* |
| Period II | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.5* | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.1* |
| Period III | 1 | *0.2* | 4 | *0.8* | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *0* | 7 | *0.4* |
| Period IV | 2 | *0.5* | 4 | *1.0* | 24 | *8.0* | 109 | *21.8* | 139 | *8.7* |
| Period V | 6 | *1.5* | 2 | *0.4* | 7 | *1.4* | 41 | *8.2* | 56 | *2.9* |
| **in all** | **12** | *0.6* | **10** | *0.4* | **35** | *2.1* | **158** | *6.6* | **215** | *2.5* |

The ten most frequent types out of 42 in the corpus with the suffix *-zhǔyì* 主义 are:

*shèhuìzhǔyì* 社会注意 'socialism': 78 tokens 1946-1998

> III: 1 in "essays"

> IV: 1 in "narrative prose Chinese", 3 in "narrative prose translated", 9 in

.     "essays", 28 in "newspaper"

> V: 4 in "narrative prose Chinese", 2 in "essays", 30 in "newspaper"

*dìguózhǔyì* 帝国主义 'imperialism': 33 tokens 1950-1978

> IV: 5 in "essays", 27 in "newspaper"

> V: 1 in "essays"

*xiūzhèngzhǔyì* 修正主义 'revisionism': 16 tokens 1968-1974 in "newspaper" (IV)

*Mǎkèsī-Lièníngzhǔyì* 马克思列宁主义 'Marxism-Leninism': 11 tokens 1956-1962

> IV: 1 in "essays", 10 in "newspaper"

*Mǎkèsīzhǔyì* 马克思注意 'Marxism': 7 tokens 1974-1978

> IV: 6 in "newspaper"

> V: 1 in "newspaper"

*Lièníngzhǔyì* 列宁主义 'Leninism': 4 tokens 1974 in "newspaper" (IV)

*xiànshízhǔyì* 现实主义 'realism': 4 tokens 1956 in "newspaper" (IV)

*zhímínzhǔyì* 殖民主义 'colonialism': 4 tokens 1962-1973

IV: 1 in "essays", 3 in "newspaper"

*zhǒngzúzhǔyì* 种族主义 'racism': 4 tokens 1988 in "newspaper" (V)

*mínzhǔzhǔyì* 民主主义 'democracy': 3 tokens 1950-1956 in "newspaper" (IV)

Of these 164 tokens, 136 appear in "newspaper", 20 in "essays", 5 in "narrative prose Chinese" and 3 in "narrative prose translated"; 1 in period III, 121 in period IV and 42 in period V.

Even though the suffix *-zhǔyì* 主义 is not as new a suffix as e.g. *-huà* 化, it seems to have come into use only slowly compared to the other three affixes. When it came to be frequently used in period IV, this happened all of a sudden, though limited to the formal or comparatively formal registers "newspaper" and "essays". The first *-ism* appeared in the corpus texts in "newspaper" 1909 (*qīnlüèzhǔyì* 侵略主义 'jingoism'[67]). Whereas period IV was the time of *-isms*, they lost ground in period V. For comparison: In the Communist Manifesto appear 21 tokens of *zhǔyì* 主义 per 5,000 characters.

This observation holds true for all four affixes. No matter how early, how late or how steadily they developed, all of them reached their peak in period IV and abated in period V, though not below the level of period III. One of them, *-huà* 化, shifted its core area from "essays" to "newspaper", but generally all four appear most frequently in the formal register "newspaper". Many new words were formed with the new affixes, but those investigated here seem to be linked to the new language of political movement in period IV Maoist China: 'counterrevolutionary', 'revolutionize', 'committee member', and 'socialism'.

---

[67]   "Jingoism: an attitude of belligerent nationalism, the English equivalent of the term chauvinism." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, <http://emedien.sub.uni-hamburg.de/han /EncyclopaediaBritannicaOnline/www. britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/303992 /jingoism>, access 23.08.12, 14:30.

### 5.1.3  Plural marker –*men* 们

According to Wang Li, the plural marker –*men* 们 was originally restricted to personal pronouns and to address forms in human relations, like "*zǐmèimen*" 姊妹们 'sisters', "*yātoumen*" 丫头们 'maidservants', and could not be used in "*héshangmen*" 和尚们 'Buddhist monks' or "*shénxianmen*" 神仙们 'immortals'. The extension of its function to marking the plural form of professions, like "*zuòjiāmen*" 作家们 'authors' and "*gōngrénmen*" 工人们 'workers', or to the usage of "*rénmen*" 人们 'people' as indeterminate pronoun, he sees as a result of 'Europeanization'. The tendency in Europeanized Chinese was, he writes in the early 1940ies, to use -*men* to mark any plural form of nouns denoting persons. Even though "up to now, this use is not very widespread", he predicted that during the next three to five years it might reach that degree. He felt sure, though, that nobody would try to add a plural marker to nonhuman objects (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 463, *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 354f.).

For the authors from Beijing Normal University, stabilization and standardization are the most important aspects in the use of the plural marker -*men* 們. Although it was used already in modern Chinese (近代汉語 *jīndài Hànyǔ*),[68] this usage was, according to the authors, neither consummate nor stable. After May Fourth and under the influence of Indo-European languages, it "progressively became generally used and stabilized, gradually turning into a category and standard".[69] The tendency to use -*men* 們 even where there was no "risk of misunderstanding" they explain by the users' wish "to ensure the accuracy of expression formally".[70] In contrast to the older usage, -*men* 們 is by 1959 also used with class nouns, with quantitative modifiers and with neutral *tā* 它. The authors saw the category "number" gradually taking shape in modern Chinese, but being limited to appellative pronouns or nouns denoting humans, whereas

---

[68]  Periodization of Chinese see introduction.

[69]"五四以后，在印欧語的影响下，才初步普遍地运用起来，稳定下来，以至逐渐形成一种范畴、一种规范。" (Beijing Normal University 1959: 138).

[70]  "[...]以便从形式上保障表达的准确性" (Beijing Normal University 1959: 138).

nonhuman nouns still could not use it liberally and generally (Beijing Normal University 1959: 139).

In 1985 C. Kubler does not only see a "great increase in the use of -*men* with nouns denoting persons, but also, sometimes, with nonhuman referents" (Kubler 1985: 47). For his investigation in the use of -*men* by Ba Jin he remarks, that in all the cases listed, the plural marker might have been used prior to any 'Europeanization', but seldom was, "plurality usually being either left unmarked or else indicated by combinations of numbers and measures or by context" (Kubler 1985: 49f.) As most striking he regards the marked plural form *rénmen* 人们 'people', which "could never be pluralized before" (Kubler 1985: 50). As possible, though uncommon in Modern Chinese, he regards the use of -*men* with groups of different nouns like "*jiěmèimen*" 姐妹们 'sisters', "*dìmèimen*" 弟妹们' younger brothers and younger sisters' and other kinship terms. He mentions one other function of -*men* of indicating not only the person named but a number of other people when added to personal names or kinship terms, similar to *děng* 等. As examples in Ba Jin's *Jiā* he lists:

覺新們 *Juéxīnmen* 'Juexin and the rest' (5 occurrences)

覺英們 *Juéyīngmen* 'Jueying and the rest' (2 occurrences)

淑英們 *Shūyīngmen* 'Shuying and the rest' (2 occurrences)

and ten more examples.

Non-human referents may occur with -*men* when personified (Kubler 1985: 54). As restrictions in the use of -*men* he lists

1. nouns modified by number and measure,

2. predicate nominative in equational constructions,

3. nouns following *yǒu* 有 and *méiyǒu* 没有,

though with exceptions (Kubler 1985: 55).

Contrary to Wang Li, E. Gunn points out that not only personal pronouns and nouns designating family relationship, but also occupations were pluralized by -*men* 們 for centuries before the 20th century. The affixiation of -*men* to *rén* 人 'man' occurred,

according to him, "at least since the late Qing" (Gunn 1991: 266). The frequent affixiation of *-men* to inanimate substantives he explains as the result of a "commitment to literal translation of foreign texts" in the 1920's (ibid.), although it was not limited to translations, as he shows by an example of narrative prose.[71]

A. Peyraube objects that the use of the plural suffix *-men* 们 or similar plural suffixes (like *-man* 满, *-mei* 每, *-men* 门) with [- human] nouns and even with [- animate] nouns "can be traced back of many centuries" (Peyraube 2000: 4), especially to the Yuan- (1279-1368), but also to the Ming-Dynasty (1368-1644), but had become obsolete under the Qing (1644-1911), surviving only in some dialects of e.g. Hebei, Qinghai and Shanxi. However, he sees a possible influence of European language structures on *-men* in its proliferation in the 1920-30ies, when it could act "as suffix to all kinds of nouns" (Peyraube 2000: 11), also citing the famous example *sānzhūmen hóngmen méiguihuāmen* 三株们红们的玫瑰花们 'three red roses'.[72]

Xie Yaoji explains that the "plural auxiliary *men*" (*fùliàng zhùcí "men"* 复量助词"们": Xie 2001: 18) was on one hand like the English plural markers "-s, -es, ies" bound to nouns denominating persons or to personal pronouns, and on the other hand extended the scope of its use to the non-human 3$^{rd}$ person pronoun *tā* (它、牠).[73] He also

---

[71] *Xīngxīngmen* 星星们 - 'the stars' - appearing once in Lao Shes novel *Luotuo xiangzi* (Rickshaw) from 1936.

[72] This example, with the plural marker *-men* added not only to the head noun, but also to its modifiers, and additionally violating the rule that nouns modified by number and measure do not take *-men*, appears repeatedly in the discussions on the Europeanization of Chinese Grammar. It is cited by C. Kubler (1985: 48), by E. Gunn (1991: 68) and A. Peyraube (2000: 11), who have all three taken it from Huang Zunsheng (Huang Zunsheng 黄尊生 (Wong Chun-sang) (1963): *Zhongguo wenzizhi ouhua wenti* 中國文字之歐化問題 (On the Westernization of the Chinese written language). Penang: Guomin yinwu youxian gongsi, p.9. Bibliographical reference by E. Gunn (including characters, 1991: 326) and C. Kubler (1985: 151) and A. Peyraube (2000: 22) for the publishing company. The book is unavailable to me). I came across it in a slightly altered variant (as *sānzhūmen hóngmen mǔdanhuāmen* 三株们的红们的牡丹花们) in one of Zhou Zuoren's essays from 1922, where he on his part brought it forward as an illustration of what would be going too far on an otherwise correct path in reforming the Chinese language by tolerating "Europeanization" ("照这样看来，现在各派的国语改革运动都是在正轨上走着，或者还可以逼紧一步，只不必到"三株们的红们的牡丹花们"的地步：曲折语的 语尾变化虽然是极便利，但在汉文的能力之外了。" Zhou Zuoren 1922) Regrettably, he did not say where he found it.

[73] 复量助词"们"一方面如 "-s, -es, ies" 等黏附在指人的名词或代词（"我，你、他"）后面表示复数，一方面扩大了应用范围，连非指人代词"它、牠"都可以加上。 (Xie 2001: 18).

observes that "*men*" expresses "crowd" (*zhòngshù* 众数), not a definite quantity, but that in comparison to foreign languages (sic: *duìzhào wàiyǔ* 对照外语) there was a "*wǔ ge xuéshengmen*" "五个学生们", and that it was even added to words already expressing plurality like "masses", "spectators", "troops", that it was, besides, arbitrarily added to words that could have a plural like "little animals" (*xiǎo dòngwùmen* 小动物们) or "stars" (*xīngxīngmen* 星星们) even without stylistic need, thus creating an inundation by "*men*" 们.[74]

He Yang points out, like E. Gunn, that the plural marker –*men* 们 does not only occur with nouns referring to human relations but frequently with all kinds of nouns designating human beings, like e.g. *héshangmen* 和尚们 "Buddhist monks" (He 2008: 188f.). Still, he holds that there has indeed been a change in the use of –*men* 们 since May Fourth, concerning both the extension of scope and the increase of frequency (ibid. 189). The extension of scope on its part concerns the use of –*men* 们, especially frequent in written language, to mark the plural of generic nouns formerly unmarked in Chinese (ibid. 189-191). Regarding the use of –*men* 们 to mark the plural of nouns designating animals (as well as things), he quotes Sun Xixins (1990) estimation that this did occur e.g. through the influence of Mongolian grammar (He 2008: 191).

---

[74] 复量助词"们"表示众数，不作数量定指，但对照外语，就有"五个学生们"的用法，甚至连"群众、观众、军队"等已含复数的也加上"们"；此外，没有修辞需要，对可有复数的名词都随意加用（如"小动物们，星星们"），造成"们"的泛滥。(Xie 2001: 19).

**Plural marker *-men* in the corpus texts**

**Table 5-6: Plural marker *-men* in the corpus texts**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* |
| personal | Period I | 46 | *15.3* | 12 | *2.4* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 58 | *4.6* |
| pronoun + | Period II | 18 | *3.6* | 64 | *12.8* | 77 | *19.3* | 0 | *0* | 159 | *8.6* |
| *-men* 们/們 | Period III | 127 | *25.4* | 150 | *30.0* | 145 | *29.0* | 17 | *3.4* | 439 | *22.0* |
| excl. neutral | Period IV | 67 | *16.8* | 137 | *34.3* | 126 | *42.0* | 151 | *30.2* | 481 | *30.1* |
| *tā* 它 | Period V | 107 | *26.8* | 101 | *20.2* | 107 | *21.4* | 62 | *12.4* | 377 | *19.8* |
| | **in all** | **365** | ***17.4*** | **464** | ***19.3*** | **455** | ***26.8*** | **230** | ***9.6*** | **1,514** | ***17.6*** |
| only neutral | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| personal | Period II | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.1* |
| pronoun | Period III | 2 | *0.4* | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 4 | *0.2* |
| *tā* 它们/們 | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 5 | *1.3* | 6 | *2.0* | 1 | *0.2* | 12 | *0.8* |
| | Period V | 2 | *0.5* | 4 | *0.8* | 1 | *0.2* | 1 | *0.2* | 8 | *0.4* |
| | **in all** | **4** | ***0.2*** | **12** | ***0.5*** | **7** | ***0.4*** | **2** | ***0.1*** | **25** | ***0.3*** |
| *rénmen* | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| 人们/們 | Period II | 5 | *1.0* | 0 | *0* | 3 | *0.8* | 0 | *0* | 8 | *0.4* |
| | Period III | 5 | *1.0* | 6 | *1.2* | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.4* | 13 | *0.7* |
| | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 6 | *1.5* | 3 | *1.0* | 3 | *0.6* | 12 | *0.8* |
| | Period V | 6 | *1.5* | 4 | *0.8* | 12 | *2.4* | 5 | *1.0* | 27 | *1.4* |
| | **in all** | **16** | ***0.8*** | **16** | ***0.7*** | **18** | ***1.1*** | **10** | ***0.4*** | **60** | ***0.7*** |
| other | Period I | 1 | *0.3* | 3 | *0.6* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 4 | *0.3* |
| [+human] | Period II | 2 | *0.4* | 11 | *2.2* | 6 | *1.5* | 0 | *0* | 19 | *1.0* |
| nouns + | Period III | 16 | *3.2* | 26 | *5.2* | 16 | *3.2* | 0 | *0* | 58 | *2.9* |
| *-men* | Period IV | 37 | *9.3* | 31 | *7.8* | 20 | *6.7* | 31 | *6.2* | 119 | *7.4* |
| 们/們 | Period V | 36 | *9.0* | 23 | *4.6* | 26 | *5.2* | 5 | *1.0* | 90 | *4.7* |
| | **in all** | **92** | ***4.4*** | **94** | ***3.9*** | **68** | ***4.0*** | **36** | ***1.5*** | **290** | ***3.4*** |
| [-human] | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| nouns + | Period II | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| *-men* | Period III | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.1* |
| 们/們 | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period V | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | **in all** | **0** | ***0*** | **0** | ***0*** | **2** | ***0.1*** | **0** | ***0*** | **2** | ***0.0*** |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| all occurrences of *-men* 们/們 | Period I | 47 | *15.7* | 15 | *3.0* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 62 | *5.0* |
| | Period II | 25 | *5.0* | 76 | *15.2* | 88 | *22.0* | 0 | *0* | 189 | *10.2* |
| | Period III | 150 | *30.0* | 184 | *36.8* | 163 | *32.6* | 19 | *3.8* | 516 | *25.8* |
| | Period IV | 104 | *26.0* | 179 | *44.8* | 155 | *51.7* | 186 | *37.2* | 624 | *39.0* |
| | Period V | 151 | *37.8* | 132 | *26.4* | 146 | *29.2* | 73 | *14.6* | 502 | *26.4* |
| | **total** | **477** | ***22.7*** | **586** | ***24.4*** | **550** | ***32.4*** | **278** | ***11.6*** | **1,891** | ***22.0*** |
| thereof: quantitative Modifier + noun + *-men* 们/們 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period II | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.1* |
| | Period III | 5 | *1.0* | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 6 | *0.3* |
| | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 3 | *0.8* | 1 | *0.3* | 1 | *0.2* | 5 | *0.3* |
| | Period V | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *0* | 3 | *0.2* |
| | **in all** | **5** | ***0.2*** | **7** | ***0.3*** | **3** | ***0.2*** | **1** | ***0.0*** | **16** | ***0.2*** |

The corpus samples show that Wang Li was right or nearly right in assuming that nobody would try to add a plural marker to nonhuman objects. Of all 1,891 occurrences of *-men* only two are combined with nonhuman referents. These are, though, not to be found in translations but in two essays. The use of *rénmen* 人们 clearly increased from period I to period V, but the use of personal pronoun + *-men* reached its peak in period IV, whereas in period V it was less used than in period III. The pluralization of various referents denoting humans - kinship terms, professions, terms indicating membership - was most common in period IV and decreased in period V.

Insofar, both Wang Li and C. Kubler were right, as this specific usage did increase during the time they were regarding respectively, but wrong in assuming that this development would continue.

Concerning the occurrence in different registers, one should expect that the plural marker *-men* is most common in translated prose, influenced by the marked plural in European languages, and therefore especially in connection with nouns denoting humans. This is indeed the case for periods II - IV, but in V the use of *-men* in "narrative prose Chinese" caught up with translations - the fashion seems to have spread. Looking at the average numbers, the translation register is still yet surpassed by "essays", the register most convenient for linguistic innovation.

Regarding the distribution of *-men* 们 for the five periods each, it appears in period I only in two of the four registers with 76% in "narrative prose Chinese" and 24% in "narrative prose translated". In period II the ratio is 13%, 40%, 47%, 0% in the order of the registers as shown in the table, in period III it is 29%, 36%, 32%, 4% each, in period IV it is 17%, 29%, 25%, 30% each, and in period V the ratio is 30%, 26%, 29%, 15%.

The much more frequent use of *-men* in "narrative prose Chinese" in period I is due to the fact that many translations were translations into Literary Chinese (in this corpus 3 of 5 samples in both periods I and II), where *-men* 们 is hardly used at all, while narrative prose was more frequently written in vernacular than in Literary Chinese. Quantitative modifiers (*xiē* 些 'some', *qún* 群 'group of') were used together with nouns + *-men* since period II, but not very often.[75]

The earliest nouns to be found in this corpus that are marked as plural by *-men* were *xiǎojiě* 小姐 'Miss', 'young lady' and *nánrén* 男人 'man' in "narrative prose translated" in 1900. The earliest to be found in "narrative prose Chinese" is *nǔkè* 女客 'female guest' in 1905. Nevertheless, examples like *niángrmen* 娘儿们 '(married) women' and *yātoumen* 丫头们 'maids', 'servant girls' do appear on earlier occasions, e.g. in the *báihuà* novels *Érnǔ yīngxiōng zhuàn* from the 19th century and *Hónglóumèng* from the 18th century.

The nouns most commonly marked with *-men* are (by frequency)

*tóngzhì* 同志 'comrade', 25 tokens in 13 samples between 1938 and 1999

*bīng* 兵 'soldier', 24 tokens in only 2 samples in 1973 and 1999

*háizi* 孩子 'child', 23 tokens in 9 samples between 1934 and 1999

*zhànshì* 战士 'soldier', 16 tokens in only 2 samples in 1956 and 1962

*péngyou* 朋友 'friend', 15 tokens in 8 samples between 1938 and 1999

---

[75] Additionally, they do occur in "old *báihuà*" narrative prose like *Hónglóumèng* - other than suggested by the Beijing Normal University authors.

*tóngxué* 同学 'fellow student', 12 tokens in 7 samples between 1930 and 1978

*gōngrén* 工人 'worker', 11 tokens in 7 samples between 1923 and 1999.

*Gōngrén* 工人 'worker' was the earliest of these, and it was continuosly used through the periods (2 tokens in II, 2 in III, 3 in IV and 4 in V). The other examples are not as evenly distributed. Children, for example, are spoken of (or spoken to) mostly in period V (16 tokens), but less in periods IV and III (3 and 4 tokens), while period IV was obviously the time to address comrades (20 tokens of 25 altogether), who were less mentioned in periods III (1 token) and V (4 tokens). Friends, on the other hand, show the opposite distribution: 8 tokens in period III, 6 tokens in period V, but only one in period IV. Soldiers play a leading part in two samples of "narrative prose Chinese" and one of "narrative prose translated", which accounts for their high frequency in few samples. Fellow students are somewhat prominent in period IV (7 tokens), compared to periods III (3 tokens ) and V (1 token).

## 5.1.4  Progressive aspect marker *–zhe* 着

Wang Li states in the 1940ies that -*zhe* 着 originally was only used to mark the progressive aspect, but "in modern Europeanized texts is often misused" and added to any verb, "just for the author's stylistic convenience, regardless of the verb being in the progressive aspect or not" (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 466),[76] as if it were simply a verbal suffix (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 356).[77] In an annotation he remarks that

> [i]n the last years, this tendency [to reduce -*zhe* to a verbal suffix without function as progressive aspect marker - R.C.] is becoming more acute. "*Yǒu*" ['to have'] could up to now not combine with "*zhe*", but now some people write it as "*yǒuzhe*", like: "These words are having a very profound

---

[76] "在现代欧化的文章里，往往有些滥用"着"字的地方。只要是一个动词，就可以随着作者行文的便利而加上一个"着"字，不问其是否进行貌。" (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 466). In 1936 Wang Li proposed the use of -*zhe* 着 as verbal marker in romanized writing (Wang Li 1990: 211f.).

[77] "[...]，它们似乎只是一般动词的后附体。" (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 356).

meaning." This is too much transgressing the habit of spoken Chinese language, and it has no benefit.[78]

This remark by Wang Li 1944 is taken up by the authors from Beijing Normal University 1959, who quote it to illustrate how fast perspectives can change: "Even though one should resist to it [the use of *yǒuzhe*], yet now one is accustomed to it."[79] For them, the salient point again is stabilization and standardization of a phenomenon long known to Chinese, its extension to verbs where it could not be used earlier showing its stabilization and normalization. They emphasize that though in the past there were some verbs to which *-zhe* could not be added, this is possible today.

Li Chi also asserts that "-*chao*[80] 着 has always been used in northern dialects to denote the progressive aspect of an action" (Li Chi 1962: 42). She cites Gao Mingkais distinction between *chao* [*zhao*] expressing resultative aspect and *chao* [*zhao*] expressing progressive or durative aspect, in modern Beijing dialect differentiated in sound into *chao* [by Li Chi, in Pinyin *zhao*] for the former and *cho* [by Li Chi, in Pinyin *zhe*] for the latter, together with his comment that "[t]he latter use of *chao* [expressing progressive or durative aspect] [...] has become popular only in modern times" (Li Chi 1962: 44f.).

C. Kubler writes that, although the suffix -*zhe* 着 "has long been used in Northern Mandarin dialects to indicate the progressive aspect of action verbs", it "has come to be used much more widely than it was before" since the beginning of European influence (Kubler 1985: 62). Traditionally, he continues, -*zhe* could only be used with action verbs; intrinsically continuous verbs being "seldom used with this suffix before the beginning of Western influence" (Kubler 1985: 64). As "most striking new use of -*zhe*"

---

[78]"最近几年来，这种倾向厉害了。"有"字向来不和"着"结合的，现在也有人写成"有着"，例如："这句话是有着很深的意义的"。这太违反中国的口语习惯了，也没有什么好处。" (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 359).

[79] "應該加以抵制，可是現在却用得習慣了。" (Beijing Normal University 1959: 140).

[80] Li Chi used "*chao*" to transcribe the character 着, while other authors used "*zhe*". The character 着 can be read in five different ways, see below "Progressive/durative aspect marker -*zhe* 着 in the corpus texts".

he mentions its use with *yǒu* 有, which "never occurred before", having become popular only since the May Fourth period (Kubler 1985: 65).

E. Gunn sees a similar connection between the time after 1918 and the occurrence of -*zhe* together with verbs with inherently continuous meaning. As for *yǒuzhe* 有着, he suspects that it might "well have appeared first in translations by Lu Xun of Japanese and German texts" (Gunn 1991: 192), but doubts a straightforward transfer of European or Japanese durative forms, as "the use of Chinese -*zhe* even in translated texts is not always consistent with its [sic] appearance in foreign-language sources" (Gunn 1991: 192 and 194).

Xie Yaoji again sees the need for standardization, as the Beijing Normal University authors did 40 years earlier, when he presents the two different currents concerning the use of -*zhe*, one emphasizing that the possibility to use -*zhe* should depend on the semantic content of a verb, the other holding that this should be decided by grammatical form, not by semantic content (Xie 2001: 20).

A. Peyraube, after remarking that "*zhuo*/*zhe* 著 [...] was already a suffix expressing the continuative aspect" (2000: 4) in the 10th century, and a progressive suffix in the 11th century, and since then has been used with a large variety of verbs, acknowledges that the contact with European languages may have played its role in extending and popularizing its use.

According to He Yang, -*zhe* 着 is much more frequently used in written language after May Fourth, also in places where it had not to be used earlier (He 2008: 182). It is added to verbs and stative verbs to express more clearly the being in progress of some action or the continuation of some state (ibid.). Generally speaking, it was before May Fourth seldom used with abstract verbs or verbs with unclear action quality, but after May Fourth in written language frequently added also to verbs without any action quality (He 2008: 182). "*Yǒuzhe*" 有着 appears only in written and in formal spoken language, not in everyday spoken language (ibid. 184f.). Nevertheless the application scope has broadened and the frequency increased (ibid. 185).

**Progressive/durative aspect marker *-zhe* 着 in the corpus texts**

To analyze the increase of *-zhe* in the 20th century, a semantic analysis of the verbs that combine with this aspect marker is indispensable. Also, the findings of the characters 着 (simplified) or 著 (traditional) in the samples have to be differentiated into a) the aspect marker 着/著 *-zhe*, b) the resultative complement 着 *zháo* (indicating accomplishment), c) the verb 着 *zháo* 'touch', 'catch', d) the noun 着 *zhāo* 'trick', 'move', and e) the verb 着 *zhuó* 'attach', 'touch' as well as the stative verb, verb or noun 著 *zhù* 'notable', 'write', 'manifest', 'book'. As this is not feasible with an untagged corpus, and as, on the other hand, the chance that one of the other words or morphemes written with 着 or 著 increased beyond proportionality is rather low, the analysis was instead limited to counting tokens of 着/著 in total, irrespective of their semantic content, and to counting occurrences of *yǒuzhe* 有着 'having' and of a selection of verbs with inherent durative meaning, as they are given in examples by Li Chi, C. Kubler and E. Gunn, i.e. *xiāngxìn* 相信 'to believe in', *cúnzài* 存在 'to exist', *jìxù* 继续 'to continue', *yìwèi* 意味 'to mean', 'to signify', *fāzhǎn* 发展 'to develop' and *kèfú* 克服 'to surmount'.

**Table 5-7: Progressive marker *-zhe* in the corpus texts**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | |
| 着/著 *zhe* / *zhāo* / *zháo* / *zhuó* / *zhù* in total | Period I | 63 | *21.0* | 58 | *11.6* | -- | -- | 13 | *2.9* | 134 | *10.7* |
| | Period II | 145 | *29.0* | 83 | *16.6* | 70 | *14.0* | 9 | *2.0* | 307 | *16.6* |
| | Period III | 279 | *55.8* | 205 | *41.0* | 149 | *29.8* | 9 | *1.8* | 642 | *32.1* |
| | Period IV | 146 | *36.5* | 204 | *51.0* | 78 | *26.0* | 57 | *11.4* | 485 | *30.3* |
| | Period V | 155 | *38.8* | 130 | *26.0* | 165 | *33.0* | 26 | *5.2* | 476 | *25.1* |
| | **in all** | **788** | *37.5* | **680** | *28.3* | **462** | *27.2* | **114** | *4.8* | **2,044** | *23.8* |
| *yǒuzhe* 有着 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period II | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period III | 0 | *0* | 5 | *1.0* | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 6 | *0.3* |
| | Period IV | 2 | *0.5* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 3 | *0.2* |
| | Period V | 1 | *0.3* | 1 | *0.2* | 2 | *0.4* | 1 | *0.2* | 5 | *0.3* |
| | **in all** | **3** | *0.1* | **6** | *0.3* | **3** | *0.2* | **2** | *0.1* | **14** | *0.2* |
| verbs with inherent durative meaning + *-zhe* | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period II | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.1* |
| | Period III | 4 | *0.8* | 2 | *0.4* | 4 | *0.8* | 0 | *0* | 10 | *0.5* |
| | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 4 | *0.8* | 4 | *0.3* |
| | Period V | 2 | *0.5* | 0 | *0* | 3 | *0.6* | 0 | *0* | 5 | *0.3* |
| | **in all** | **7** | *0.3* | **2** | *0.1* | **7** | *0.4* | **4** | *0.2* | **20** | *0.2* |
| most frequent verbs used with *-zhe* (≥ 20 tokens in the corpus) | Period I | 18 | *6.0* | 8 | *1.6* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 26 | *2.1* |
| | Period II | 32 | *6.4* | 11 | *2.2* | 9 | *2.3* | 0 | *0* | 52 | *2.8* |
| | Period III | 60 | *12.0* | 33 | *6.6* | 20 | *4.0* | 0 | *0* | 113 | *5.7* |
| | Period IV | 34 | *8.5* | 46 | *11.5* | 11 | *3.7* | 3 | *0.6* | 94 | *5.9* |
| | Period V | 34 | *8.5* | 41 | *8.2* | 31 | *6.2* | 8 | *1.6* | 114 | *6.0* |
| | **in all** | **178** | *8.5* | **139** | *5.8* | **71** | *4.2* | **11** | *0.5* | **399** | *4.6* |

The verbs most frequently combined with *-zhe*, each of these with at least 20 tokens in

the entire corpus, are:                                                                                     no. of tokens

*wàng* 望 expect, hope, look towards                                                      57

*jiē* 接 receive, welcome, accept, join, connect[81]                            54

*dài* 带 bear, carry, take, bring                                                              54

---

[81]    Also lexicalized as *jiēzhe* 接着: catch, follow, carry on; next, immediately after.

| | |
|---|---|
| *chuān* 穿 wear (excluding *chuānzhuó* garment, dress) | 38 |
| *xiào* 笑 laugh | 37 |
| *shuō* 说 speak, say, tell, talk | 35 |
| *kàn* 看 see, look, observe | 31 |
| [both aspect particle *-zhe* and resultative complement *-zháo*] | |
| *zuò* 坐 sit | 25 |
| *gēn* 跟 follow, accompany, imitate[82] | 24 |
| *suí* 随 follow, accord with, accompany[83] | 24 |
| *ná* 拿 bring, take, apprehend, grasp | 21 |

Regarding the ocurrence of the characters 着/著 in total, there is a considerable increase from period I to III by 300%, together with a certain decrease in the following two periods (period V = 235% of period I). This pattern is repeated in the distribution of verbs with inherent durative meaning + *-zhe*. Still, neither the 20 tokens of durative verbs + *-zhe* nor the 14 tokens of *yǒuzhe* 有着 confirm the presumption that *-zhe* has become a simple verbal suffix that has lost its semantic content.

The reason for this decrease in periods IV and V might well be that, after two periods of morphologically quite inventive writing, stabilization and standardization set in. Also, Wang Lis fear that people might get accustomed to using freak constructions like *yǒuzhe* 有着 does not seem to have come true yet - at least, this construction does appear more frequently in translated prose than in originally Chinese samples. The further development of this construction deserves continued observance.

## 5.1.5 New prepositions consisting of verb and conjunction: *duìyú* 对于, *guānyú* 关于 and similar constructions

In *Zhōngguó xiàndài yǔfǎ*, Wang Li notes in his chapter on the 'Europeanization' of conjunctive and connective elements the increase of connective elements in

---

[82] Also lexicalized as *gēnzhe* 跟着: follow; after, following.

[83] Also lexicalized as *suízhe* 随着: along with, in the wake of, in pace with.

Europeanized writings, and divides them into conjunctions (*liánjiécí* 联结词 - chapters 5.2.3.2 and 5.2.4.1 in this thesis), relative tertiaries (*guānxi mòpǐn* 关系末品),[84] and "verbs similar to conjunctions" (*jìnsì liánjiécí de dòngcí* 近似联结词的动词): the latter consisting of a composition of Chinese verb and connective[85] like *duìyú* 对于 '(in regard) to', 'toward', 'at', 'for', or *guānyú* 关于 'about', 'on', 'with regard to', 'concerning', as an equivalent to English connectives like 'to' or 'for', formerly not known to Chinese.

Li Chi sees another reason besides the imitation of European language structure for the emergence of this combination of the verb *duì* 對 and the preposition *yú* 於, which belongs to the literary language: "When *báihuà* came to be used by educated people at the beginning of the century, *yú* 於 was joined to *duì* 對 as *duìyú* 對於 to make a slightly more bookish and therefore more dignified expression." (Li 1962: 48f.) Additionally, it "was found to be useful as an equivalent to the English expressions 'with regard to' and 'concerning' (Li 1962: 49). Concerning the use of *guānyú* 关于(關於), she writes that this "has come to be extensively used" (Li 162: 49) since 1949, at least partly because Mao liked to use it in titles of articles, or at the beginning of speeches, which made it very popular. Another tendency, she writes, "has been to adopt some of the uses of *yú* in the literary language by placing it after verbs in order to bring out their passive sense" (Li 1962: 50). The third of these compound prepositions mentioned by Li Chi is *yóuyú* 由于 'because of', both used as preposition and as conjunction joining clauses (Li 1962: 61).

---

[84] Wang Li adopted the theory of three ranks (primary, secondary and tertiary, or *shǒupǐn* 首品, *cìpǐn* 次品, *mòpǐn* 末品 in Chinese) from Otto Jespersen's *Philosophy of Grammar* (1924). Their description by Jespersen is: "In any composite denomination of a thing or person [...], we always find that there is one word of supreme importance to which the others are joined as subordinates. This chief word is defined (qualified, modified) by another word, which in its turn may be defined (qualified, modified) by a third word, etc. We are thus led to establish different "ranks" of words according to their mutual relations as defined or defining." (Jespersen, O.,The Philosophy of Grammar (1924), p. 96). The "relative tertiaries" Wang Li wrote about in *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* (1985: 362 f.) are *zài* 在 translating the English relational words ‚in' or ‚on', and *dāng* 当 translating English ‚when'.

[85] Wang Li calls 于 a "connective" (联结成份 *liánjié chéngfèn*) (see *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 359 and below, chapter 5.2.3), in current terminology it is a preposition.

E. Gunn, on the other hand, sees "a variety of Chinese words and phrases [...] invented employing *yu* as an analogue to Japanese *ni*, which occured in the original Japanese phrases" since the beginning of the 20th century or even a little earlier (Gunn 1991: 217), the most salient outcome being a new set of coverbs[86]: *guānyú* 關於, *duìyú* 對於, *yóuyú* 由於 'owing/due to', 'because of' and *jīyú* 基於 'in view of', 'because of'.

Xie Yaoji mentions *duìyú* 对于 and *guānyú* 关于 as two examples of the influence of European language structure with its larger need for prepositions, which led to an increase of prepositions in Chinese as well (Xie Yaoji 2001: 18).

Also He Yang sees the influence of English and other Indo-European languages at work in the emergence of the prepositions (*jiècí* 介词) *guānyú* 关于 and *duìyú* 对于 around May Fourth, with *duìyú* 对于 emerging prior to *guānyú* 关于. He cites Ohta Tatsuo, Lü Shuxiang, and Wang Li all attesting the emergence of *guānyú* 关于 "not before nor during Qing dynasty" (Ohta Tatsuo 1958: 239 in He Yang 2008: 115), "under the influence of foreign grammar" (Lü Shuxiang 1942: 207 in He Yang 2008: 115), "since May Fourth in the process of translating English prepositions" (Wang Li 1943: 359; 1944: 474 in He Yang 2008: 115).[87] He Yang attests its absence in *báihuà* novels until May Fourth (He 2008: 115). The composition (*zǔhé* 组合) of the verb *guān* 关 and the preposition *yú* 于, on the other hand, was current already during Han dynasty and in use until the end of Qing dynasty, but this composite was of verbal instead of prepositional character (ibid.), meaning "connect to" (*guānxì dào* 关系到 or *shèjí dào* 涉及到) (ibid. 115f.).[88] He Yangs argumentation in favor of contact influence is as follows:

---

[86] On the terminological question whether to prefer "preposition" or "coverb" see chapter 5.2.3. "Coverb" is used by Gunn and Kubler, "preposition" by Li and Peyraube.

[87] It seems to be used as preposition *guānyú* rather than as verb *guān* + preposition *yú* in "newspaper" samples since 1906. The first example is "英国各报社切望登载**关于**海勒丹大臣之事" (*Dàgōngbào* 1906), the next two are "通信员云**关于**中国简派总领事官驻于该城之议颇表同情又闻**关于**对待中国侨民" (*Dàgōngbào* 1909).

[88] Concerning the continuum from verb to preposition (coverb) in Chinese (Classical to Modern) see chapter 5.2.3.

> [i]f this preposition is not a product of imitating foreign prepositional
> usage, but emerged from Chinese itself, then it did most probably evolve
> from the semantically close verb-preposition composite *guānyú* 关于 by
> way of lexicalization and grammaticalization, which should be a gradual
> process that cannot be completed in a short time; but we could not
> discover this process for *guānyú* 关于. (He 2008: 118)[89]

Influence by Indo-European languages would then serve to skip the steps of
lexicalization and grammaticalization by directly converting the verb-preposition
composite into a grammatical marker (ibid.).

The case of *duìyú* 对于 he describes as similar, but observes that it occurred earlier as
preposition than *guānyú* 关于, offering instances of prepositional usage since 1902 (He
2008: 119). Since the 1920ies, he writes, the frequency rate of *duìyú* 对于 is, depending
on the text type, about the same as today (ibid.: 121).

---

[89] "如果这一介词不是通过模仿外语介词用法产生的，而是汉语自身发展出来的，那么最有可能
师从意义相近的动介词组"关于"发展演化而来，而一个动介词组要演化为一个介词，需要经过
词化和语法化的过程，这应该是一个渐变的过程，不会在一个很短的时间内完成，但我们并没
有发现动介词组"关于"曾经历过这样一个过程。" (He 2008: 118).

**New prepositions in the corpus texts**

**Table 5-8: *duìyú* 对于, *guānyú* 关于, *jīyú* 基于, *yóuyú* 由于 in the corpus texts**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | *average* | narrative prose translated | *average* | essays | *average* | newspaper | *average* | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *duìyú* 对于 / 對於 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | *--* | 7 | *1.6* | 7 | *0.6* |
| | Period II | 4 | *0.8* | 4 | *0.8* | 21 | *5.3* | 22 | *4.9* | 51 | *2.8* |
| | Period III | 6 | *1.2* | 8 | *1.6* | 20 | *4.0* | 19 | *3.8* | 53 | *2.7* |
| | Period IV | 4 | *1.0* | 6 | *1.5* | 3 | *1.0* | 16 | *3.2* | 29 | *1.8* |
| | Period V | 5 | *1.3* | 6 | *1.2* | 11 | *2.2* | 15 | *3.0* | 37 | *1.9* |
| | **in all** | **19** | ***0.9*** | **24** | ***1.0*** | **55** | ***3.2*** | **79** | ***3.3*** | **177** | ***2.1*** |
| *guānyú* 关于 / 關於 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | *--* | 5 | *1.1* | 5 | *0.4* |
| | Period II | 1 | *0.2* | 2 | *0.4* | 3 | *0.8* | 6 | *1.3* | 12 | *0.6* |
| | Period III | 4 | *0.8* | 3 | *0.6* | 11 | *2.2* | 6 | *1.2* | 24 | *1.2* |
| | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.5* | 5 | *1.7* | 9 | *1.8* | 16 | *1.0* |
| | Period V | 2 | *0.5* | 3 | *0.6* | 0 | *0* | 9 | *1.8* | 14 | *0.7* |
| | **in all** | **7** | ***0.3*** | **10** | ***0.4*** | **19** | ***1.1*** | **35** | ***1.5*** | **71** | ***0.8*** |
| *jīyú* 基于 / 基於 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period II | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period III | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.1* |
| | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 1 | *0.1* |
| | Period V | 1 | *0.3* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.1* |
| | **in all** | **2** | ***0.1*** | **0** | ***0*** | **0** | ***0*** | **1** | ***0.0*** | **3** | ***0.0*** |
| *yóuyú* 由于 / 由於 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period II | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.5* | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.1* |
| | Period III | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 2 | *0.1* |
| | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 6 | *1.5* | 2 | *0.7* | 8 | *1.6* | 16 | *1.0* |
| | Period V | 3 | *0.8* | 4 | *0.8* | 1 | *0.2* | 9 | *1.8* | 17 | *0.9* |
| | **in all** | **4** | ***0.2*** | **10** | ***0.4*** | **5** | ***0.3*** | **18** | ***0.8*** | **37** | ***0.4*** |
| | **total** | **32** | ***1.5*** | **44** | ***1.8*** | **79** | ***4.6*** | **133** | ***5.5*** | **288** | ***3.4*** |

*Duìyú* 对于 '(in regard) to', 'toward', 'at', 'for' is the most frequent of all by far, while *jīyú* 甚于 'in view of', 'because of' hardly counts. Interestingly, again, the period of highest frequency was period III for *duìyú* 对于 and *guānyú* 关于, both decreasing in

periods IV and V. He Yangs estimation that the frequency rate of *duìyú* 对于 remained stable since the 1920ies is not mirrored in table 5-8, except maybe in the "narrative prose Chinese" register. Only *yóuyú* 由于 was barely used until 1949 and flourished afterwards. As regards the registers, the prevalence of these, according to Li Chi, 'bookish' constructions in "newspapers" and second in "essays" is striking; these prepositions do not belong to the realm of fiction.

## 5.2 Syntax

In Chinese, it is only a small step from morphology to syntax, from the structure of words to the structure of phrases and of sentences.[90] Still, regarding Colloquial Chinese, I would not go as far as Georg von der Gabelentz did when he stated for Literary Chinese that "[d]ie chinesische Grammatik ist, abgesehen von der Laut- und Schriftlehre, lediglich Syntax, und will als solche begriffen sein" (von der Gabelentz: 1953: 19). Syntax and morphology must neither be mixed up, but cannot be cut apart either (Feng 1997: 345).

In both of Wang Lis chapters on Europeanized grammar, the section on the "Increase of subjects and of copulas" (*zhǔyǔ hé xìcí de zēngjiā* 主语和系词的增加, see below chapter 5.2.1.1) in Europeanized texts follows right after the "Creation of polysyllabic words" (*fùyīncí de chuàngzào* 复音词的创造, see above 5.1.1). The next section then is "Increase of sentence length" (*jùzi de yáncháng* 句子的延长): Generally speaking, Wang Li notices that the sentences in Europeanized modern Chinese written texts were much longer than those in his comparison works *Hónglóu mèng* and *Érnǚ yīngxióng zhuàn*. He attributes this increase of sentence length to various influences by Europeanized syntax. On the other hand, there have been extremely long attributes for some time in Chinese as well as embedded sentences,[91] so that the long relative clauses from European languages translated quite easily into long Chinese attributes. Long

---

[90]  See, e.g., Norman 1988: 156, who wrote "In the absence of any well-defined phonological criteria for distinguishing words from phrases, this has made it difficult to draw a hard and fast boundary between morphology and syntax in Chinese."

[91]  See A. Peyraube 2000: 9.

attributes and a strong tendency for nominalization do also exist in non-Sinitic languages in China, like Manju.

## 5.2.1 Nominal phrases

### 5.2.1.1 *Increase of subjects*

The fact that in several European written languages the subject cannot be omitted as it can in Chinese has not only left some impression on Chinese learners of English, German or French, but has also, according to Wang Li and others, led to an increase of subjects in written Chinese. Under the influence of Western languages, these authors say,[92] writers tended to use subjects more often than before, be it as a conscious decision to enhance the exactness and completeness of the sentence in the first place, or be it as an unconscious imitation of Western language structure. Alain Peyraube, on his part, puts the increase of subjects into the larger context of an equally possible shift "from a discourse-oriented topic to a sentence-oriented subject [...] already at work in the Medieval vernacular" (Peyraube 2000: 9).

### 5.2.1.2 *Increase of copula shì* 是

As remarkable as European languages' need for subjects was their need for a copulative verb like "be", "être", or "sein" in sentences with predicate adjectives. Wang Li attributes the novel preference - of some authors - for "complete" sentences with subject and verb to his contemporaries' acquaintance with Western languages influencing their writing style in Chinese.[93] In these "Europeanized" writings he sees the tendency[94] to replace descriptive sentences (with predicate adjective, which in Chinese do not need

---

[92]   Regrettably not specifying which of the differently functioning Western languages they meant. See
       Wang Li *Xiàndài Hànyǔ* 1985: 341ff., *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 443ff., Beijing Normal University 1959: 160ff.,
       also citing Qu Qiubai 瞿秋白 "Zhōngguó wénxué gǔwù chénlièguǎn" 中國文學古物陳列館, Kubler
       1985: 84ff., Xie 2001: 18.

[93]   "一般学过西文的人，往往以为没有主语的句子是不通的；没有"verb"的句子也是不通的，所
       以欧化文章里的主语和系词就比非欧化的文章增加了许多。" Wang Li, *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 443.

[94]   Not without mitigating this statement one page later, qualifying this to be "seemingly in most cases
       only a kind of tendency, not yet having turned into a position" ("但是，现代文人对于描写句加"是"
       字，似乎多数只是一种倾向，并未成为一种主张，[...]"). *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 345.

any copula) by equative sentences (with predicate noun, which in Chinese do use the copula *shì* 是). This results in the addition of *shì* 是 to descriptive sentences, preferring "*tā de qīzi shì hěn hǎo de*" ("他的妻子是很好的") to "*tā de qīzi hěn hǎo*" ("他的妻子很好", both sentences mean "His wife is very good"), though not for the sake of highlighting and asserting, which is still the main function of the *shì ...de*-construction, but of adding a copula to this sentence form. Consequentially, in a further step, the final *de* 的 could be omitted, ending up with sentences like "*huā shì hóng*" ("花是红", "(the) flower(s) are/is red"), according to Wang Li formerly nonexistent in China (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 344f.). At the same time, Wang Li affirms that Chinese originally uses *shì* 是 to enforce descriptive sentences, even without a following *de* 的 (ibid. 345). He does not give an explanation how to distinguish the European-influenced copula *shì* 是 from the traditional enforcing *shì* 是 in descriptive sentences.

The same applies for C. Kubler, who writes more or less the same as Wang Li about the use of "the equative verb *shi* ,be' with stative verbs, thus following completely the western model" (Kubler 1985: 132), including the assertion that "in traditional Chinese, *shi* is used only in predicate nominatives" (Kubler 1985: 133) and the concession that "*shi* can occur with stative verbs to indicate stress" (ibid.), although "it does not seem to be so used in the examples above" (ibid.).[95] Additionally, C. Kubler points out that the *shì...de*-construction "has increased greatly in Modern Chinese" (Kubler 1985: 134).

In his short summary of the 'Europeanization' of Chinese grammar, Xie Yaoji does not give any examples, but simply states that

---

[95] Of the three examples from Ba Jin's novel *Jia* Kubler gives on p. 133 - (1) "*Tāmen xǐhuan zhì nà 'shīzi chóu', yīnwèi tā shì bǐjiào fùzá ér yǒu qù.*" "他們喜歡擲那「獅子籌」因為牠是比較複雜而有趣。" (They liked to play that "Lion" dice game, because it was more complicated and more interesting), (2) "*Zhè xiē shēngmìng duìyú tā shì tài qīn'ài le...*" "這些生命對於他是太親愛了..." (The lives of those people were very dear to him ...) and (3) "*Zhè shíhou tā shì hěn juéjiàng de.*" "這時候他是很倔強的。" (At this time he was very stubborn) (my numbering and *Pīnyīn*, Kubler's translation) - at least for the first one this (*shì* not being used to indicate stress but as equative verb) seems to hold true, the whole sentence sounding peculiarly English with its "[...] *yīnwèi tā shì bǐjiào fùzá ér yǒu qù*", which can be translated word by word into "... because it was relatively complicated and interesting". For the other two sentences I do not quite see why *shì* 是 could not indicate stress in these cases, especially in combination with *de* 的 in (3).

Sentences with *shì* chiefly express predication or function as emphasis,
but nowadays the use of ‚*shì*' became as common and indispensable like
the English ‚be, is, am, are', regardless whether it expresses predication or
requires emphasis. [96] (Xie 2001: 18)

Alain Peyraube on his part writes about *shìde* 是的 as an assertive particle at the end of
a sentence or as an independent emphatic assertion, and about the focaliser *shi...de* 是...
的, both in use accountedly long before any potential influence by European languages,
but not about an increase in the use of the particle or the focaliser, nor about the
copulative or equative *shì* 是 discussed by Wang Li, Cornelius Kubler and Xie Yaoji or
its increased use (Peyraube 2000: 9).

**Shì 是 in the corpus texts**

The results of the counts of 1) *shì* 是, 2) *shì...de* 是...的/底, 3) *shìde* 是的 (是底 does
not appear) are shown in the following tables. Table 5-9 shows the results from all
samples, table 5-10 the results from samples written in Colloquial Chinese only. The
reason for this division is that *shì* 是 in Literary Chinese serves as demonstrative
pronoun, and only in Colloquial Chinese as copula or focaliser as described by Wang Li
and the other authors. Therefore, a simple count includes all tokens of *shì* 是 as
demonstrative pronoun in those samples from periods I to III written in Literary Chinese,
thus potentially obscuring an increase of the copula or focaliser *shì* 是.[97] A difference
between the total number of *shì* 是 in all samples (table 5-9) and the number of *shì* 是 in
Colloquial samples only (table 5-10) is to be expected for periods I-III, mostly in
narrative prose translated (7 samples in Literary compared to 8 samples in Colloquial

---

[96] " ‘是'字主要表示判断或起强调作用，但现时变得如英语 'be, is, am, are' 般普遍和需要[...]." Xie
Yaoji 2001: 18.

[97] As mentioned in chapter 4 (Corpus), the proportion of Colloquial/Literary samples is:
"Narrative prose Chinese": 3/0 in I, 3/2 in II, 5/0 in III, 4/0 in IV and V,
"Narrative prose translated": 2/3 in I, 2/3 in II, 4/1 in III, 4/0 in IV, 5/0 in V,
"Essays": 3/1 in II, 5/0 in III, 3/0 in IV, 5/0 in V,
"Newspaper": 0/9 in I, 0/9 in II, mixed in III, 10/0 in IV and V.

Chinese), followed by narrative prose Chinese (2 samples in Literary vs. 11 samples in Colloquial), and essays (1 sample in Literary vs. 8 in Colloquial Chinese).

**Table 5-9: Increase of *shì* 是, *shì...de* 是...的 and *shìde* 是的 in all samples**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* |
| 1 occurrence of 是 *shì* | Period I | 266 | *88.7* | 182 | *36.4* | -- | -- | 52 | *11.6* | 500 | *40.0* |
| | Period II | 281 | *56.2* | 205 | *41.0* | 380 | *95.0* | 33 | *7.3* | 899 | *48.6* |
| | Period III | 374 | *74.8* | 386 | *77.2* | 409 | *81.8* | 28 | *5.6* | 1,197 | *59.9* |
| | Period IV | 208 | *52.0* | 302 | *75.5* | 178 | *59.3* | 201 | *40.2* | 889 | *55.6* |
| | Period V | 354 | *88.5* | 356 | *71.2* | 329 | *65.8* | 194 | *38.8* | 1,233 | *64.9* |
| | **in all** | **1,483** | **70.6** | **1,431** | **59.6** | **1,296** | **76.2** | **508** | **21.2** | **4,718** | **54.9** |
| 2 occurrence of *shì ... de* 是 ... 的/底 | Period I | 65 | *21.7* | 32 | *6.4* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 97 | *7.8* |
| | Period II | 73 | *14.6* | 53 | *10.6* | 136 | *34.5* | 0 | *0* | 262 | *14.2* |
| | Period III | 166 | *33.2* | 139 | *27.8* | 151 | *30.2* | 5 | *1.0* | 461 | *23.5* |
| | Period IV | 67 | *16.8* | 90 | *22.5* | 63 | *21.0* | 86 | *17.2* | 306 | *19.1* |
| | Period V | 99 | *24.8* | 122 | *24.4* | 120 | *24.0* | 77 | *15.4* | 418 | *22.0* |
| | **in all** | **470** | **22.4** | **436** | **18.2** | **470** | **27.6** | **168** | **7.0** | **1,544** | **18.0** |
| 3 occurrence of *shìde* 是的 | Period I | 1 | | 0 | | -- | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | Period II | 1 | | 5 | | 0 | | 0 | | 6 | |
| | Period III | 1 | | 5 | | 0 | | 0 | | 6 | |
| | Period IV | 1 | | 2 | | 0 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| | Period V | 0 | | 5 | | 1 | | 2 | | 8 | |
| | **in all** | **4** | | **17** | | **1** | | **2** | | **24** | |
| 4 occurrence of *shì* 是 without *de* 的/底 | Period I | 200 | *66.7* | 150 | *30.0* | -- | -- | 52 | *11.6* | 402 | *32.2* |
| | Period II | 207 | *41.4* | 147 | *29.4* | 244 | *61.0* | 33 | *7.3* | 632 | *34.2* |
| | Period III | 207 | *41.4* | 242 | *48.4* | 258 | *51.6* | 23 | *4.6* | 730 | *36.5* |
| | Period IV | 140 | *35.0* | 210 | *52.5* | 115 | *38.3* | 115 | *23.0* | 580 | *36.3* |
| | Period V | 255 | *63.8* | 229 | *45.8* | 208 | *41.6* | 115 | *23.0* | 807 | *42.5* |
| | **in all** | **1,010** | **48.1** | **978** | **40.8** | **825** | **48.5** | **338** | **14.1** | **3,151** | **36.6** |

**Table 5-10: Increase of *shì* 是, *shì...de* 是...的 and *shìde* 是的 in Colloquial samples only**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | *average** | | *average** | | *average** | | *average** | | *average** |
| 1 occurrence of 是 *shì* | Period I | 266 | 88.7 | 124 | 62.0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 390 | 78.0 |
| | Period II | 195 | 65.0 | 165 | 82.5 | 353 | 117.7 | 0 | 0 | 713 | 89.1 |
| | Period III | 374 | 74.8 | 369 | 92.3 | 409 | 81.8 | 28 | 5.6 | 1,180 | 62.1 |
| | Period IV | 208 | 52.0 | 302 | 75.5 | 178 | 59.3 | 201 | 40.2 | 889 | 55.6 |
| | Period V | 354 | 88.5 | 356 | 71.2 | 329 | 65.8 | 194 | 38.8 | 1,233 | 64.9 |
| | **in all** | **1,397** | **73.5** | **1,316** | **77.4** | **1,269** | **79.3** | **423** | **28.2** | **4,405** | **65.8** |
| 2 occurrence of *shì ... de* 是 ... 的/底 | Period I | 65 | 21.7 | 32 | 16.0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 97 | 19.4 |
| | Period II | 72 | 24.0 | 53 | 26.5 | 136 | 45.3 | 0 | 0 | 261 | 32.6 |
| | Period III | 166 | 33.2 | 139 | 34.8 | 151 | 30.2 | 5 | 1.0 | 461 | 24.3 |
| | Period IV | 67 | 16.8 | 90 | 22.5 | 63 | 21.0 | 86 | 17.2 | 306 | 19.1 |
| | Period V | 99 | 24.8 | 122 | 24.4 | 120 | 24.0 | 77 | 15.4 | 418 | 22.0 |
| | **in all** | **469** | **24.7** | **436** | **25.7** | **470** | **29.4** | **168** | **11.2** | **1,543** | **23.0** |
| 3 occurrence of *shìde* 是的 | Period I | 1 | | 0 | | -- | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | Period II | 1 | | 5 | | 0 | | 0 | | 6 | |
| | Period III | 1 | | 5 | | 0 | | 0 | | 6 | |
| | Period IV | 1 | | 2 | | 0 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| | Period V | 0 | | 5 | | 1 | | 2 | | 8 | |
| | **in all** | **4** | | **17** | | **1** | | **2** | | **24** | |
| 4 occurrence of *shì* 是 without *de* 的/底 | Period I | 200 | 66.7 | 92 | 46.0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 292 | 58.4 |
| | Period II | 122 | 40.7 | 107 | 53.5 | 217 | 72.3 | 0 | 0 | 446 | 55.8 |
| | Period III | 207 | 41.4 | 225 | 56.3 | 258 | 51.6 | 23 | 4.6 | 713 | 37.5 |
| | Period IV | 140 | 35.0 | 210 | 52.5 | 115 | 38.3 | 115 | 23.0 | 580 | 36.3 |
| | Period V | 255 | 63.8 | 229 | 45.8 | 208 | 41.6 | 115 | 23.0 | 807 | 42.5 |
| | **in all** | **924** | **48.6** | **863** | **50.8** | **798** | **49.9** | **253** | **16.9** | **2,838** | **42.4** |

* Note that the factor is different from other tables as samples in Literary Chinese are excluded.

In table 5-9, which counts all occurrences of *shì* 是 regardless of its function, there is a moderate increase in the total, though not in the separate registers, to a 162% of period I in period V. In table 5-10, counting only the occurrences of *shì* 是 in Colloquial samples and therefore using a different factor to determine the average, a decrease becomes visible, with only 83% of period I in period V. The same pattern occurs in line 4, where there is an increase in table 5-9 to a 132% in period V, whereas in table 5-10 the number

of tokens in period V reach only 73% of period I. This implies that the use of *shì* 是 increased only when comparing its use at the beginning and at the end of the 20th century in both linguistic varieties, Literary and Colloquial Chinese, but not in the Colloquial variety alone.

Regarding the separate registers, the peak of occurrences of *shì* 是 never is in period V alone (in "newspaper" the numbers are the same in periods IV and V), but spreads over periods I (narrative prose Chinese), II (essays), III (narrative prose translated) and IV/V (newspaper).

Even the *shì...de*-construction, which is less suspect of being borrowed from European "to be" or "etre" than shì 是 alone, shows this pattern, with a peak in period III (table 5-9, all samples) and in period II (table 5-10, colloquial samples only). Viewed diachronically, the development of the frequency of the *shì...de*-construction is as follows:

|            | table 5-9: | table 5-10: |
|------------|------------|-------------|
| period I   | 100%       | 100%        |
| period II  | 182%       | 168%        |
| period III | 301%       | 125%        |
| period IV  | 245%       | 98%         |
| period V   | 282%       | 113%        |

Furthermore, only a thorough sentence-by-sentence analysis could tell if the increase of *shì* 是 with or without *de* 的 is due to the influence of western languages and their demand for "complete" sentences, or actually just another way of enforcing descriptive sentences.

### 5.2.1.3   *Indefinite and definite article*

A third speciality of several European languages (e.g. English, French, German and other Romance or Germanic languages; Slavic languages like Russian have none) are the definite and indefinite articles, and Wang Li assumes that it was the internalization of these languages that induced Chinese authors and translators to use indefinite articles

in Chinese as well, mostly in the form of *yī gè* 一个 or *yī zhǒng* 一种.[98] He also writes that the latter, though originally Chinese, had come to be used in large quantities only after the 'Europeanization'.[99] He points out that one reason why the indefinite article found its way so easily into Chinese was that it could be imitated very easily by using the numeral *yī* 一 "one" and a classifier, whereas the definite article is in the majority of cases impossible to imitate, though in some cases of "definite articles of fairly heavy demonstrative-ness" these would be approximately equivalent to the Chinese demonstrative pronouns *zhè* 这 and *nà* 那 (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 485).[100]

The authors of Beijing Normal University (Beijing Normal University 1959), Li Chi, Kubler or Gunn do not deal with the influence European articles might have exerted on written Chinese. In the case of the first publication, the reason might be that its main reference European language is Russian, which does not have any articles to be imitated in Chinese.

Xie Yaoji considers the articles to belong to the domain of word classes.[101] Influenced by "foreign language articles" the numeral *yī* 一 "one" plus a classifier would be used even in places where no marking of number would be necessary.[102]

Peyraube objects that neither the use of *yī* 一 + Cl as an equivalent to the indefinite article in English or French nor that of Cl + Noun as equivalent of a definite article are new to Chinese, the former being found e.g. in Han Buddhist texts, the latter having been attested in Southern dialects (Cantonese and Wu) for a long time (Peyraube 2000: 8).

---

[98] "由于西文的影响，现代中国的书报，多数是不知不觉地运用着无定冠词。凡是西文里该用无定冠词的地方，一般人就用'一个'，'一种'之类。" *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 371.

[99] "'一种'的说法虽是中国原来有的，然而它的大量应用却是欧化以后的事。" *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 488.

[100] "固然，有些指示性颇重的冠词，译成中文往往是相当于'那'字或'这'字的，[...]" *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 485.

[101] Presumably as a new word class in Chinese, but he does not explicitly say so in his 2001 article.

[102] "词类方面，受外语冠词 (article) 影响，连没有强调数目需要，也喜使用数词'一'，并跟量词'个、种'等套用。" Xie 2001: 18.

He Yang attests a clear difference in the use of *yī* 一 + Cl before and after May Fourth. Whereas before it was used to stress the number of the noun modified by it, and therefore was not used if the number need not be stressed, it came into use in the wake of numerous translations since May Fourth. Influenced by the indefinite article of the European original, the Chinese *yī* 一 + Cl was emptied of its numeral content, turning into a nominal marker. According to He Yang's counts, the frequency rate of generic determinative (or copulative) sentences (*lèishǔ pànduànjù* 类属判断句) containing *yī* 一 + Cl rose considerably in written Chinese: Although generic determinative sentences with *yī* 一 + Cl existed in old *báihuà*,[103] they were rarely used in comparison to Modern Written Chinese (He 2008: 99). He also shows that the highest frequency rate occurs in translated literature (ibid.: 99f.), infering a close connection between translations from Indo-European languages and the dynamic of this sentence structure, which is not limited to generic determinative sentences (ibid.: 100) nor to modifying nouns (ibid.: 101). As one important function of the addition of *yī* 一 + Cl to sentences he mentions nominalization of verbs and adjectives (ibid.).

---

[103] The term "Old Báihuà" (*jiù báihuà* 旧白话), meaning the written colloquial Chinese before May Fourth, was used by He Yang (cf. 2008: 2), BNU, and Xie Yaoji, whereas Kubler wrote of "traditional Chinese grammatical usage" (1985: 45 and passim).

**Numeral *yī* + classifier in the corpus texts**

**Table 5-11: Numeral *yī* 一 + *gè* 个/個 or *zhǒng* 种/種**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | *average* | narrative prose translated | *average* | essays | *average* | newspaper | *average* | total | *average* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *yí gè*<br>一个/個 | Period I | 27 | *9.0* | 14 | *2.8* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 41 | *3.3* |
| | Period II | 53 | *10.6* | 47 | *9.4* | 26 | *6.5* | 1 | *0.2* | 127 | *6.9* |
| | Period III | 97 | *19.4* | 77 | *15.4* | 62 | *12.4* | 1 | *0.2* | 237 | *11.9* |
| | Period IV | 46 | *11.4* | 46 | *11.5* | 67 | *22.3* | 35 | *7.0* | 204 | *12.8* |
| | Period V | 54 | *13.5* | 101 | *20.1* | 71 | *14.2* | 24 | *4.8* | 250 | *13.2* |
| | **in all** | **277** | ***13.2*** | **295** | ***12.3*** | **226** | ***13.3*** | **61** | ***2.5*** | **859** | ***10.0*** |
| *yì zhǒng*<br>一种/種 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.4* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.2* |
| | Period II | 1 | *0.2* | 10 | *2.0* | 23 | *5.8* | 2 | *0.4* | 36 | *1.9* |
| | Period III | 13 | *2.6* | 6 | *1.2* | 5 | *1.0* | 1 | *0.2* | 25 | *1.3* |
| | Period IV | 2 | *0.5* | 11 | *2.8* | 5 | *1.7* | 2 | *0.4* | 20 | *1.3* |
| | Period V | 21 | *5.3* | 22 | *4.4* | 21 | *4.2* | 0 | *0* | 64 | *3.4* |
| | **in all** | **37** | ***1.8*** | **51** | ***2.1*** | **54** | ***3.2*** | **5** | ***0.2*** | **147** | ***1.7*** |
| *yí gè/ zhǒng*<br>一个/個 / 种<br>/種<br>together | Period I | 27 | *9.0* | 16 | *3.2* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 43 | *3.4* |
| | Period II | 54 | *10.8* | 57 | *11.4* | 49 | *12.3* | 3 | *0.7* | 163 | *8.8* |
| | Period III | 110 | *22.0* | 83 | *16.6* | 67 | *13.4* | 2 | *0.4* | 262 | *13.1* |
| | Period IV | 48 | *12.0* | 67 | *16.8* | 72 | *24.0* | 37 | *7.4* | 224 | *14.0* |
| | Period V | 75 | *18.8* | 123 | *24.6* | 92 | *18.4* | 24 | *4.8* | 314 | *16.5* |
| | **in all** | **314** | ***15.0*** | **346** | ***14.4*** | **280** | ***16.5*** | **66** | ***2.8*** | **1,006** | ***11.7*** |

There is certainly an increase in the use of *yī* 一 + *gè* 个/個 or *zhǒng* 种/種 when regarded as a whole. For the single registers, the findings are heterogeneous. Even in the "narrative prose translated" register, where period I shows the lowest and period V the highest frequency, the growth is not continuous. The peak is for "narrative prose translated" in all three rows in period V, for "essays" and "newspaper" in period II (*yī zhǒng* 一种) and period IV (*yī gè* 一个). All in all, it is the "essay" register that contains the greatest amount of *yī* 一 + *gè/zhǒng* 个/种, a particularly convenient register to freely experiment with innovative structures, as mentioned before. If, on the other hand, *yī* 一 + *gè/zhǒng* 个/种 were used mainly to translate indefinite articles in the foreign-

language originals, then the majority of tokens should be found in the "narrative prose translated" register, which is not the case.

It has to be taken into account that a certain amount of these *yī* 一 + Cl-groups might be used to mark the number "one" and not in imitation of the English, French or German indefinite article. One could certainly argue that the influence of European languages did not only rouse the want to imitate indefinite articles, but also to mark the number more frequently than originally necessary - as shows in the increased use of the plural marker -*men* 们 (see chapter 5.1.3). In this case even less *yī* 一 + Cl-groups were used as indefinite article.

The wish to mark number more frequently than before would show in an increased use of classifiers. To exclude all occurrences of *yī* 一 + Cl, as possible indefinite article, and of *zhè/nà* 这/那 + Cl, not expressing number but definiteness, these have to be subtracted from the total number of classifiers. The following table shows the findings in the case of *gè* 个 and *zhǒng* 种.

**Table 5-12: Number of classifiers *gè* 个/個 and *zhǒng* 种/種 in the corpus texts**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* |
| all *gè* 个/個 and *zhǒng* 种/種* | Period I | 125 | *41.7* | 82 | *16.4* | -- | -- | 15 | *3.3* | 222 | *17.8* |
| | Period II | 109 | *21.8* | 101 | *20.2* | 126 | *31.5* | 28 | *6.2* | 364 | *19.7* |
| | Period III | 195 | *39.0* | 150 | *30.0* | 179 | *35.8* | 23 | *4.6* | 547 | *27.4* |
| | Period IV | 148 | *37.0* | 184 | *46.0* | 138 | *46.0* | 136 | *27.2* | 606 | *37.9* |
| | Period V | 206 | *51.5* | 262 | *52.4* | 215 | *43.0* | 134 | *26.8* | 817 | *43.0* |
| | **in all** | **783** | *37.3* | **779** | *32.5* | **658** | *38.7* | **336** | *14.0* | **2,556** | *29.7* |
| ... without *yī* 一, *zhè* 这, or *nà* 那 | Period I | 87 | *29.0* | 48 | *9.6* | -- | -- | 15 | *3.3* | 150 | *12.0* |
| | Period II | 42 | *8.4* | 38 | *7.6* | 57 | *14.3* | 25 | *5.6* | 162 | *8.8* |
| | Period III | 42 | *8.4* | 51 | *10.2* | 84 | *16.8* | 21 | *4.2* | 198 | *9.9* |
| | Period IV | 62 | *15.5* | 67 | *16.8* | 38 | *12.7* | 70 | *14.0* | 237 | *14.8* |
| | Period V | 82 | *20.5* | 66 | *13.2* | 77 | *15.4* | 76 | *15.2* | 301 | *15.8* |
| | **in all** | **315** | *16.0* | **270** | *11.3* | **256** | *15.1* | **207** | *8.6* | **1,048** | *12.2* |

* including also all words containing these characters

What the second row of this table shows is not so much an overall increase in the use of classifiers, but a rather clear distinction between the two varieties Literary Chinese, dominating in "narrative prose translated" in periods I and II as well as in "newspaper" in periods I to III, and Colloquial Chinese, dominating in "narrative prose Chinese" in all five periods as well as in "essays" in all four periods, whereas in "narrative prose translated" it established from period III and in "newspaper" from period IV onwards. The use of classifiers is special to the Colloquial variety much more than to translations. This concurs also with Peyraubes remark on the frequent use of *yī gè* 一个, *yī méi* 一枚, *yī zhǒng* 一种 in Han Buddhist texts (Peyraube 2000: 8).

A wish for precision is possibly not only responsible for an increased expression of number, but also for an increase in the use of demonstrative pronoun + classifier shown in the following table.

**Table 5-13: Demonstrative pronoun** *zhè* 这 **or** *nà* 那 **+** *gè* 个/個 **or** *zhǒng* 种/種

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* |
| 这个/個 | Period I | 8 | *2.7* | 13 | *2.6* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 21 | *1.7* |
| | Period II | 5 | *1.0* | 1 | *0.2* | 10 | *2.5* | 0 | *0* | 16 | *0.9* |
| | Period III | 17 | *3.4* | 6 | *1.2* | 7 | *1.4* | 0 | *0* | 30 | *1.5* |
| | Period IV | 23 | *5.8* | 28 | *7.0* | 10 | *3.3* | 21 | *4.2* | 82 | *5.1* |
| | Period V | 15 | *3.8* | 36 | *7.2* | 14 | *2.8* | 23 | *4.6* | 98 | *5.2* |
| | **in all** | **78** | ***3.7*** | **84** | ***3.5*** | **41** | ***2.4*** | **44** | ***1.8*** | **247** | ***2.9*** |
| 这种/種 | Period I | 3 | *1.0* | 5 | *1.0* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 8 | *0.6* |
| | Period II | 4 | *0.8* | 1 | *0.2* | 8 | *2.0* | 0 | *0* | 13 | *0.7* |
| | Period III | 7 | *1.4* | 6 | *1.2* | 17 | *3.4* | 0 | *0* | 30 | *1.5* |
| | Period IV | 4 | *1.0* | 17 | *4.3* | 9 | *3.0* | 7 | *1.4* | 37 | *2.3* |
| | Period V | 6 | *1.5* | 13 | *2.6* | 15 | *3.0* | 9 | *1.8* | 43 | *2.3* |
| | **in all** | **24** | ***1.1*** | **42** | ***1.8*** | **49** | ***2.9*** | **16** | ***0.7*** | **131** | ***1.5*** |
| 那个/個 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period II | 2 | *0.4* | 4 | *0.8* | 1 | *0.3* | 0 | *0* | 7 | *0.4* |
| | Period III | 14 | *2.8* | 3 | *0.6* | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *0* | 19 | *1.0* |
| | Period IV | 11 | *2.8* | 5 | *1.3* | 9 | *3.0* | 0 | *0* | 25 | *1.6* |
| | Period V | 17 | *4.3* | 18 | *3.6* | 11 | *2.2* | 0 | *0* | 46 | *2.4* |
| | **in all** | **44** | ***2.1*** | **30** | ***1.3*** | **23** | ***1.4*** | **0** | ***0*** | **97** | ***1.1*** |
| 那种/種 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period II | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *9* | 1 | *0.3* | 0 | *0* | 3 | *0.2* |
| | Period III | 5 | *1.0* | 1 | *0.2* | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *0* | 8 | *0.4* |
| | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 1 | *0.1* |
| | Period V | 1 | *0.3* | 6 | *1.2* | 6 | *1.2* | 2 | *0.4* | 15 | *0.8* |
| | **in all** | **8** | ***0.4*** | **7** | ***0.3*** | **9** | ***0.4*** | **3** | ***0.1*** | **27** | ***0.3*** |
| all four together | Period I | 11 | *3.7* | 18 | *3.6* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 29 | *2.3* |
| | Period II | 13 | *2.6* | 6 | *1.2* | 20 | *5.0* | 0 | *0* | 39 | *2.1* |
| | Period III | 43 | *8.6* | 16 | *3.2* | 28 | *5.6* | 0 | *0* | 87 | *4.4* |
| | Period IV | 38 | *9.5* | 50 | *12.5* | 28 | *9.3* | 29 | *5.8* | 145 | *9.1* |
| | Period V | 49 | *12.3* | 73 | *14.6* | 46 | *9.2* | 34 | *6.8* | 202 | *10.6* |
| | **in all** | **154** | ***7.3*** | **163** | ***6.8*** | **122** | ***7.2*** | **63** | ***2.6*** | **502** | ***5.8*** |

As in the case of *yī* 一 + *gè/zhǒng* 个/种, the increase is significant, although here it is even more doubtful that this is due to an imitation of European definite articles - which are in the majority of cases untranslatable, as Wang Li has asserted already.

### *5.2.1.4   New usage of pronouns*

Another outcome of the influence of Western, or Indo-European, languages is said to be a new usage of personal pronouns. This includes the written division of the 3rd person pronoun *tā*, which will be discussed in chapter 5.4.1, the increase and extension of the 3rd person neutral pronoun *tā* 它 in both its single and plural form as object, subject or attribute, referring to animate as well as inanimate referents. For the increased occurrence of adjectival clauses with pronominal heads see chapter 5.2.4.2, for the cataphoric use of personal pronouns see chapter 5.2.4.3.

The second item in Wang Lis sections on the new usage of pronouns in *Xiàndài yǔfǎ*, following his discussion on the written gender division of *tā*, is not at first sight related to 'Europeanization'. It concerns the "flexible usage" (*huóyòngfǎ* 活用法) of the two 1st person plural pronouns *wǒmen* 我们 and *zánmen* 咱们, distinguishing the exclusive and the inclusive form (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 366f.). This distinction is made in Mongolian, Manchu-Tungusic languages and in Northern Chinese dialects, but not in European or Southern Chinese languages. He mentioned both forms of the 1st person plural pronoun used as "editorial 'we'" (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 367., *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 482f.). So the 'Europeanization' consists in this stylistic innovation of the "editorial 'we'", probably influenced by European stylistic usage at that time, and not in the division of the two forms of "we". Its inclusion in his chapter on Europeanized grammar shows that Wang Lis understanding of 'grammar' was broad enough to include stylistic issues.[104]

Concerning the emergence of the neutral 3rd person pronoun *tā* 它[105], Wang Li writes that it "can be regarded as a newly coined pronoun, because its many uses did not exist

---

[104] For grammar being included in rhetoric see Alleton, Viviane: "Migration of Grammars" pp. 213-14, for style as a part of grammar see von der Gabelentz *Sprachwissenschaft* "Weist man dies der Stilistik zu, so erklärt man einen Theil der Stilistik für einen Bestandtheil der Grammatik. Und das ist er meiner Meinung nach allerdings" p.110. Von der Gabelentz *Chinesische Grammatik*, letzter Teil Viertes Hauptstück: Stilistik (1953: 518-527).

[105] The alternative character *tā* 牠 for the 3rd person neutral pronoun, written with the classifier "animal/cow" 牛 is mentioned by Wang Li, Beijing Normal University, Kubler, Gunn, and Xie Yaoji, but does not appear in the corpus samples.

originally in Chinese"[106] influencing the sentence structure (*Yŭfă lĭlùn* 1984: 481). He advises not to use it in places where it could be omitted (*Xiàndài yŭfă* 1985: 368).

Kubler points out that "[b]efore the beginning of European influence on Chinese, *tā* "it" was ordinarily limited in occurrence to the object position, where it was usually preceded by the pretransitive coverb *bă*" (Kubler 1985: 76), and that the plural *tāmen* never occurred in the sense of neuter (ibd.). He further states that *tā* (meaning the neutral *tā*) "has become much freer in occurrence than it was before" under the influence of Western languages, "[i]t now occurs as the subject of sentences and its use as an object has greatly increased" (Kubler 1985: 77).

In his short article, Xie Yaoji only states very generally the increase of personal pronouns (Xie 2001: 18).

He Yang, on the other hand, sees the written division of *tā* as the prerequisite for its increased use:

> After the gender division of the Chinese 3rd person pronoun, it became possible to use a 3rd person pronoun in places where originally it was necessary to name a person or a thing to avoid ambiguity. An important phenomenon actuated by this possibility is the clearly increased frequency of 3rd person pronoun usage in written Chinese compared to the time before this division.[107]

At the same time he notes an overall increase of *tā* referring to inanimate things (He 2008: 72f.), not only in the object position as already possible in earlier times, but also in the subject position of a sentence (He 2008: 82).

---

[106] "至于"它"字则竟可以说是新创造的一个代词，它的许多用途都不是中国所原有的。" (*Xiàndài yŭfă* 1985: 367).

[107] "汉语的第三人称代词有了性的分化以后，原本为了避免表达不清而必须使用人或事物名称的地方，也可以使用第三人称代词了，由此引起的一个重要现象是：与产生性的分化之前相比，汉语书面语中第三人称代词的使用频率明显增加。" (He 2008: 71).

**Pronouns in the corpus texts**

As it is outside the limits of this study to check the animateness of the referents of all 2.204 tokens of the general/male *tā* 他, or even of all 451 occurrences of *tā* 他 in the 34 text samples without any gender division of the 3rd person pronoun, the search has to be restricted to the number and position of the character *tā* 它. For similar reasons, *zhī* 之 as pronoun in object position is not counted, as this would require a sentence-by-sentence check of all 3468 occurences of *zhī* 之 to determine if it is the object pronoun or the genetive marker.

In the following tables, the numbers of all personal pronouns in the different periods and registers are compared to those of neutral *tā* 它 to show the range of these changes. The personal pronouns counted are the 1st person pronouns *wǒ* 我, *wú* 吾 and *zán* 咱, the 2nd person pronouns *nǐ* 你, *nín* 您, *rǔ* 汝 and *ěr* 尔, and the 3rd person pronouns *tā* 他 (male)/她 (female)/它 (neuter) and *yī* 伊, including their marked plural forms (们/們) if existent.

## Table 5-14: All personal pronouns

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | average | | average | | average | | average | | average |
| All | Period I | 388 | 129,3 | 379 | 75.8 | -- | -- | 106 | 23.6 | 873 | 69.8 |
| personal | Period II | 700 | 140.0 | 956 | 191.2 | 502 | 125.5 | 62 | 13.8 | 2,220 | 120.0 |
| pronouns | Period III | 1,126 | 225.2 | 837 | 167.4 | 730 | 146.0 | 139 | 27.8 | 2,832 | 141.6 |
| (1st, 2nd, | Period IV | 509 | 127.3 | 770 | 192.5 | 307 | 102.3 | 220 | 44.0 | 1,806 | 112.9 |
| 3rd) | Period V | 720 | 180.0 | 1,111 | 222.2 | 703 | 140.6 | 145 | 29.0 | 2,679 | 141.0 |
| | in all | 3,443 | 164.0 | 4,053 | 168.9 | 2,242 | 131.9 | 672 | 28.0 | 10,410 | 121.1 |
| thereof | Period I | 184 | 61.3 | 262 | 52.4 | -- | -- | 86 | 19.1 | 532 | 42.6 |
| 1st person | Period II | 390 | 78.0 | 541 | 108.2 | 275 | 68.8 | 50 | 11.1 | 1,256 | 67.9 |
| pronouns | Period III | 399 | 79.8 | 305 | 61.0 | 451 | 90.2 | 129 | 25.8 | 1,284 | 64.2 |
| only | Period IV | 202 | 50.5 | 235 | 58.8 | 175 | 58.3 | 131 | 26.2 | 743 | 46.4 |
| | Period V | 341 | 85.3 | 391 | 78.2 | 405 | 81.0 | 59 | 11.8 | 1,196 | 63.0 |
| | in all | 1,516 | 72.2 | 1,734 | 72.3 | 1,306 | 76.8 | 455 | 19.0 | 5,011 | 58.2 |
| ... | Period I | 80 | 26.7 | 66 | 13.2 | -- | -- | 3 | 0.7 | 149 | 11.9 |
| 2nd person | Period II | 82 | 16.4 | 266 | 53.2 | 71 | 17.8 | 6 | 1.3 | 425 | 23.0 |
| pronouns | Period III | 262 | 52.4 | 123 | 24.6 | 48 | 9.6 | 3 | 0.6 | 436 | 21.8 |
| only | Period IV | 77 | 19.3 | 118 | 29.5 | 19 | 6.3 | 9 | 1.8 | 223 | 13.9 |
| | Period V | 111 | 27.8 | 188 | 37.6 | 68 | 13.6 | 0 | 0 | 367 | 19.3 |
| | in all | 612 | 29.1 | 761 | 31.7 | 206 | 12.1 | 21 | 1.2 | 1,600 | 18.6 |
| ... | Period I | 124 | 41.3 | 51 | 10.2 | -- | -- | 17 | 3.8 | 192 | 15.4 |
| 3rd person | Period II | 228 | 45.6 | 149 | 29.8 | 156 | 39.0 | 6 | 1.3 | 539 | 29.1 |
| pronouns | Period III | 465 | 93.0 | 409 | 81.8 | 231 | 46.2 | 7 | 1.4 | 1,112 | 55.6 |
| only | Period IV | 230 | 57.5 | 417 | 104.3 | 113 | 47.0 | 80 | 16.0 | 840 | 52.5 |
| | Period V | 268 | 67.0 | 532 | 106.4 | 230 | 46.0 | 86 | 17.2 | 1,116 | 58.7 |
| | in all | 1,315 | 62.6 | 1,558 | 64.9 | 730 | 42.9 | 196 | 8.2 | 3,799 | 44.2 |

Personal pronouns appear obviously most frequently in narrative prose, in translations slightly more frequently than in originally Chinese narrative prose, with the exception of 1st person pronouns which occur most frequently in "essays". The particular proportions are:

|  | narrative prose | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Chinese | translated | essays | newspaper | total |
| all personal pronouns | 33% | 34% | 27% | 6% | 100% |
| 1st person | 30% | 30% | 32% | 8% | 100% |
| 2nd person | 39% | 43% | 16% | 2% | 100% |
| 3rd person | 35% | 36% | 24% | 5% | 100% |

Viewed horizontally by register, the proportions for the entirety of personal pronouns and for 3rd person pronouns are similar, whereas 2nd person pronouns do appear pronouncedly more often in "narrative prose translated" and 1st person pronouns more often in "essays". Viewed vertically by time (see table 5-14), the proportions show literary developments: The fashion of focussing on the 1st person started in "narrative prose translated" in period II, spread in period III on to "essays", in period IV even branched off to "newspaper" (though here the 1st person pronouns were used in the plural form or at least in the plural sense, presumably in the attempt to create a politically desired sense of unity in this highly ideological period)[108] and reached "narrative prose Chinese" in period V. The 2nd person was used most frequently in periods II and III, while the 3rd person attracted notice mostly in periods III, IV and V. The increase, however, was not at all steady, and the number of personal pronouns, in total or in particular, reached its peak only in ¼ of the cases in period V.

---

[108] Like e.g. *wǒ guó* 我国/國 for "our country = China", 78 tokens, thereof 70 in newspaper, thereof 12 in period IV and 23 in period V, or *wǒ jūn* 我军/軍 for "our troops/army", 27 tokens in newspaper between 1906 and 1942.

**Table 5-15: Neutral 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun *tā* 它, including marked plural form**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | average | | average | | average | | average | | average |
| neutral 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun *tā(men)* 它(们) | Period I | *1 | *0.3* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.1* |
| | Period II | 5 | *1.0* | 4 | *0.8* | 2 | *0.5* | 0 | *0* | 11 | *0.6* |
| | Period III | 34 | *6.8* | 9 | *1.8* | 12 | *2.4* | 0 | *0* | 55 | *2.8* |
| | Period IV | 12 | *3.0* | 17 | *4.3* | 18 | *6.0* | 14 | *2.8* | 61 | *3.9* |
| | Period V | 27 | *6.8* | 29 | *5.8* | 27 | *5.4* | 10 | *2.0* | 93 | *4.9* |
| | **in all** | **79** | *3.8* | **59** | *2.5* | **59** | *3.5* | **24** | *1.0* | **221** | *2.6* |
| thereof marked plural *tāmen* 它们 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period II | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.1* |
| | Period III | 2 | *0.4* | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 4 | *0.2* |
| | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 5 | *1.3* | 6 | *2.0* | 1 | *0.2* | 12 | *0.8* |
| | Period V | 2 | *0.5* | 4 | *0.8* | 1 | *0.2* | 1 | *0.2* | 8 | *0.4* |
| | **in all** | **4** | *0.2* | **12** | *0.5* | **7** | *0.4* | **2** | *0.1* | **25** | *0.3* |

*In the digitized corpus sample, not necessarily in the original edition.

The use of neutral marked plural *tāmen* 它们 is indeed rare (0.24% of all pronouns, 0.57% of all 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns); if it appears, it does so mostly in "narrative prose translated",[109] second most in "essays". As for the neutral 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun regardless of its number, its percentage of all personal pronouns as well as of 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns increases steadily from 0,1% (all) / 0,5% (3<sup>rd</sup>) in period I to 3,5% (all) / 8,3% (3<sup>rd</sup>) in period V.

It has to be kept in mind that what shows here is only the use of the character *tā* 它, not the use of the general *tā* 他 referring to nonhuman or inanimate referents. The same caution as for the increase of the neutral 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun *tā* 它 holds for the sentence position occupied by *tā* 它, visible in the following table.

---

[109] It is possible that this is due to the influence of the Indo-european original, although indirectly. The original languages of the translations in question are Russian, English and French. Neither English nor Russian have any gender difference in the plural form of the 3rd person pronoun, and French distinguishes only male and female. I have no information about any intermediary language.

**Table 5-16: Sentence position of neutral 3$^{rd}$ person pronouns *tā* 它 and *tāmen* 它们**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | average | narrative prose translated | average | essays | average | newspaper | average | total | average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| as object* or patient | Period I | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.1 |
| | Period II | 2 | 0.4 | 3 | 0.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0.3 |
| | Period III | 20 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.4 | 8 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 1.5 |
| | Period IV | 7 | 1.8 | 8 | 2.0 | 6 | 2.0 | 4 | 0.8 | 25 | 1.6 |
| | Period V | 11 | 2.8 | 15 | 3.0 | 11 | 2.2 | 6 | 1.2 | 43 | 2.3 |
| | **in all** | **41** | *2.0* | **28** | *1.2* | **25** | *1.5* | **10** | *0.4* | **104** | *1.2* |
| as subject* or agent | Period I | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Period II | 2 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.2 |
| | Period III | 12 | 0.6 | 6 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0.9 |
| | Period IV | 2 | 0.5 | 5 | 1.3 | 8 | 2.7 | 9 | 4.5 | 25 | 1.6 |
| | Period V | 13 | 3.3 | 16 | 3.2 | 12 | 2.4 | 2 | 0.4 | 43 | 2.3 |
| | **in all** | **30** | *1.4* | **27** | *1.1* | **21** | *1.2* | **11** | *0.7* | **89** | *1.0* |
| as attribute | Period I | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Period II | 1 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0.2 |
| | Period III | 6 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.2 | 4 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0.6 |
| | Period IV | 3 | 0.8 | 6 | 1.5 | 6 | 2.0 | 4 | 0.8 | 19 | 1.2 |
| | Period V | 4 | 1.0 | 3 | 0.6 | 9 | 4.5 | 2 | 0.4 | 18 | 1.0 |
| | **in all** | **14** | *0.7* | **12** | *0.5* | **20** | *1.2* | **6** | *0.4* | **52** | *0.6* |

*In pivotal sentences, where *tā(men)* 它(们) appears both as object of the first and subject of the second verb, it is counted twice (altogether 15 instances).

The rising numbers in this table mirror the increased use of the neutral 3$^{rd}$ person pronoun *tā* 它. But only in periods I to III *tā* 它 in object position prevails, in periods IV and V object and subject position are balanced in the total. In the separate registers *tā* 它 as subject slightly outnumbers its use as object in two of four registers ("essays" and "newspaper") in period IV and in three of four registers (narrative prose Chinese, narrative prose translated, essays) in period V. Concerning the occurrence of neutral *tā* 它 in subject position and its increased use as an object, Kubler was right.

**Table 5-17: Neutral *tā(men)* 它(们) as object of *bǎ* 把 compared to male/general and female *tā(men)* as object of *bǎ* 把**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | average | | average | | average | | average | | average |
| Neutral *tā* | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period II | 1 | *0.2* | 3 | *0.6* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 4 | *0.2* |
| | Period III | 3 | *0.6* | 0 | *0* | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *0* | 5 | *0.3* |
| | Period IV | 2 | *0.5* | 4 | *1.0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 6 | *0.4* |
| | Period V | 1 | *0.3* | 5 | *1.0* | 2 | *0.4* | 2 | *0.4* | 10 | *0.5* |
| | **in all** | **7** | ***0.3*** | **12** | ***0.5*** | **4** | ***0.2*** | **2** | ***0.1*** | **25** | ***0.3*** |
| General/ male and female *tā* | Period I | 4 | *1.3* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 4 | *0.3* |
| | Period II | 2 | *0.4* | 3 | *0.6* | 4 | *1.0* | 0 | *0* | 9 | *0.5* |
| | Period III | 6 | *1.2* | 6 | *1.2* | 4 | *0.8* | 0 | *0* | 16 | *0.8* |
| | Period IV | 5 | *1.3* | 14 | *3.5* | 3 | *1.0* | 1 | *0.2* | 23 | *1.4* |
| | Period V | 3 | *0.8* | 14 | *2.8* | 6 | *1.2* | 0 | *0* | 23 | *1.2* |
| | **in all** | **20** | ***1.0*** | **37** | ***1.5*** | **17** | ***1.0*** | **1** | ***0.0*** | **75** | ***0.9*** |

In period I there is still no neutral *tā* 它 functioning as object in *bǎ*-sentences, in period II the proportion is 4 (31%) neutral to 9 (69%) general/male or female *tā*, in period III the proportion is 5 (23%) to 16 (73%), in period IV it is 6 (21%) to 23 (79%) and in period V 10 (30%) to 23 (70%). So neutral *tā* 它 as object of *bǎ* 把 did not gain on general/male and female *tā* 他/她, but since its appearance in period II it took over a relatively stable proportion between 1/5 to 1/3 of the overall increased occurence of *tā* as object of *bǎ* 把, which in turn amounts to a relatively stable 14% of all *bǎ*-sentences in each period.[110]

---

[110] In period I, *tā* is the object in 11% of all *bǎ*-sentences, in period II in 16% of all *bǎ*-sentences, period III 12%, and periods IV and V 14% each. The occurrence of the character *bǎ* 把 (all occurrences, including the syntactic marker, the classifier and the verb) increased from 35 tokens in period I (100%) to 236 in period V (647%).

### *5.2.1.5   Increase, extension and differentiation of de ( 的, 底) as marker(s) of syntactical relation*

The early treatises on 'Europeanization' by Wang Li and the authors of Beijing Normal University still deal with the syntactical relation marker *de* as one, the process of their unambiguous division in writing still under way or only just finished. The later authors Li Chi, Kubler, Gunn and Peyraube discuss the adverbial marker only. Xie Yaoji on the whole follows Wang Li, and He Yang treats both the written division of the structural particle *de* and the extension of the adverbial marker *de* 地. The discussion of the adverbial marker *de* 地, though, belongs rightly to the next chapter 5.2.2 on verb phrases, while the differentiation of *de* in the written form will be treated in chapter 5.4.2. Therefore, only the expositions by Wang Li and the Beijing Normal University authors are subject of this chapter.

Consistent with the different orientations of his two grammars, Wang Li approaches *de* differently in *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* and in *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn*. In *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* (1985: 355) he starts his discussion of *de* from the three uses of *de* 的 in translations from English, i.e. a) to translate English "of", and as a genitive marker, like in "the son of my friend" translated as "我的朋友的儿子", b) as a marker for adjectives and sentences serving as secondaries (relative clauses or attributives), like in "a beautiful girl" translated as "一个美丽的少女" or "The man who came here this morning was my school friend" translated as "今天早上到这儿来的那人是我的同学", and c) as a marker for tertiaries (adverbs), like in "He works carefully" translated as "他很留心的工作". He remarks additionally that the 'Europeanization' degree of c) is the highest, as this phrasing was originally uncommon in China. In the following he discusses the graphic distinction of these three types of de 的 (see chapter 5.4.2 of this thesis). The structural particle *de* 得 is not mentioned neither in this context nor in its correspondent part in *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn*.

In his more theoretical oriented *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* (1984: 463), he starts from the description of the historical uses of *de* 的 as marker for secondaries and tertiaries and their varying graphic representations in different times since the Song dynasty, passing on to

discussions of his time on which graph to use for which function, which he identifies as another example of Europeanized grammar appearing only in written language, like the gender distinction of *tā* 他/她/它. In *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* he lists *de* 的 together with *men* 们 and *zhe* 着 as markers that do originally exist in Chinese, but which are Europeanized insofar as their use has been extended.

The authors from Beijing Normal University discuss *de* 的 as a special preposition in Chinese (Beijing Normal University 1959: 142),[111] which has been given a new differentiating norm since May Fourth to render possible the "clearer and more precise expression of the specific relations between words",[112] though only in the written form (see chapter 5.4.2). As in both texts by Wang Li, the particle or particles discussed are the attributive and genetive or possessive marker (today written 的) and the adverbial marker (today written 地), the structural particle *de* 得 is not mentioned here.

**The syntactical marker *de* in the corpus texts**

The search results for *de* 的 or *de* 底 in the corpus samples, however, have to be correlated to the occurrences of the Literary Chinese syntactic marker *zhī* 之, because *de* and *zhī* do not only serve as indicators of the two varieties Colloquial and Literary Chinese,[113] but the increase of the first and the decrease of the second are closely related to the replacement of one linguistic variety by the other as written norm. Besides, it is necessary to exclude *de* 的/底 as sentence final particle, as it occurs e.g. in the *shì...de* 是...的-construction (see chapter 5.2.1.2).

---

[111] *De* 的 was also treated as preposition (*jiècí* 介词) by Li Jinxi and Liu Shiru in *Hànyǔ yǔfǎ jiàocái* 汉语语法教材 (Teaching materials on Chinese grammar) 1957.

[112] "为了让它更清楚准确地表示出词语之间某种特定关系来" Beijing Normal University 1959: 142.

[113] Besides, *zhī* 之 appears in some samples also as pronoun in object position (see ch. 5.2.1.4).

**Table 5-18:** *zhī* 之 **and** *de* 的/底 **in the corpus samples**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | average | narrative prose translated | average | essays | average | newspaper | average | total | average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *zhī* 之 | Period I | 97 | *32.3* | 375 | *75.0* | -- | -- | 648 | *144.0* | 1120 | *89.6* |
| | Period II | 254 | *50.8* | 428 | *85.6* | 190 | *47.5* | 493 | *109.6* | 1365 | *73.8* |
| | Period III | 44 | *8.8* | 141 | *28.2* | 62 | *12.4* | 465 | *93* | 712 | *35.6* |
| | Period IV | 5 | *1.3* | 10 | *2.5* | 38 | *12.7* | 50 | *10.0* | 103 | *6.4* |
| | Period V | 39 | *7.8* | 37 | *7.4* | 61 | *12.2* | 31 | *6.2* | 168 | *8.8* |
| | **in all** | **439** | *20.9* | **991** | *41.3* | **351** | *20.7* | **1687** | *70.3* | **3468** | *40.3* |
| *de* 的/底 (excl. SFP) | Period I | 257 | *85.7* | 161 | *32.2* | -- | -- | 3 | *0.7* | 421 | *33.7* |
| | Period II | 674 | *134.8* | 423 | *84.6* | 130 | *32.5* | 6 | *1.3* | 1233 | *66.7* |
| | Period III | 1228 | *245.6* | 779 | *155.8* | 872 | *174.4* | 59 | *11.8* | 2938 | *146.9* |
| | Period IV | 551 | *137.8* | 709 | *177.3* | 600 | *200.0* | 972 | *194.4* | 2832 | *177.0* |
| | Period V | 711 | *177.8* | 803 | *160.6* | 797 | *159.4* | 820 | *164.0* | 3131 | *164.8* |
| | **in all** | **3421** | *162.9* | **2875** | *119.8* | **2399** | *141.1* | **1860** | *77.5* | **10555** | *122.7* |
| *zhī* 之 and *de* 的/底 together | Period I | 354 | *118.0* | 536 | *107.2* | -- | -- | 651 | *144.7* | 1541 | *123.3* |
| | Period II | 928 | *185.6* | 851 | *170.2* | 320 | *80.0* | 499 | *110.9* | 2598 | *140.4* |
| | Period III | 1272 | *254.4* | 920 | *184.0* | 934 | *186.8* | 524 | *104.8* | 3650 | *182.5* |
| | Period IV | 556 | *139.0* | 719 | *179.8* | 638 | *212.7* | 1022 | *204.4* | 2935 | *183.4* |
| | Period V | 750 | *187.5* | 840 | *168.0* | 858 | *171.6* | 851 | *170.2* | 3299 | *173.6* |
| | **in all** | **3860** | *183.8* | **3866** | *161.1* | **2750** | *161.8* | **3547** | *147.8* | **14023** | *163.1* |

The most conspicuous outcome of these counts is the relatively constant decrease of *zhī* 之 and increase of *de* 的/底 until period IV, while in period V a backlash set in. At this time not only the increase of *de* 的/底 came to a halt, but even though *zhī* 之 came back in narrative prose, the total number of attributive or genetive markers waned, returning to numbers less than in period III in three of four registers and in the total. The reasons remain hypothetical, perhaps the "clearer and more precise expression of the specific relations between words" mentioned by the authors of Beijing Normal University (1959: 142, see above) lost its former importance.

## 5.2.2 Verbal phrases

### 5.2.2.1 *Increase and extension of adverbial marker de* 的/地

The alleged 'Europeanization' of the adverbial marker *de* 的/地 is only partly discussed in Wang Lis chapter 44 on the 'Europeanization' of markers, and partly in his chapter 41 on word formation. Obviously he classed it to be more of a morphological than of a syntactical innovation, closely following its classification in English, where the shift from noun to adjective to adverb or verb to adjective naturally belongs to word formation and therefore to morphology.[114] He saw the limits of translation reached in cases where Western languages (meaning English) transform a word from noun to adjective (like "instinct" to "instinctive") and then on to adverb ("instinctively"), as Chinese could translate the noun as *běnnéng* 本能 and the adjective as *běnnéngde* 本能 的, but not the adverb as *běnnéngde* 本能地, because Chinese nouns could not be used as "mode tertiaries" (*fāngshì mòpǐn* 方式末品). To use them so "for Chinese grammar would be a reform".[115] For the same reason he judged that "historically", "socially", "grammatically" translated as "*lìshǐde* 历史地", "*shèhuìde* 社会地" and "*yǔfǎde* 语法 地" would be absurd (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 442).

It is precisely this statement that the authors of Beijing Normal University took up 15 years later, showing that by their time the above given forms were becoming quite "reasonable".[116] They on their part cherished the adverbization of nouns as a "progressive tendency in the improvement of Chinese word formation",[117] together with the adverbization of verbs and adjectives.

Li Chi deemed the main difference to be that originally the adverbial marker *de* 地 (*ti* by Li Chi) "was usually reserved strictly for words that were adverbs" (Li 1962: 46),

---

[114] Although *de* 的/地 certainly is a marker, it is open to question whether it is a morphological one.

[115] "对于中国语法是一种改革" (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 442).

[116] "已經发展得"成話"了" (Beijing Normal University 1959: 150).

[117] "改进汉语創词法的一种进步趋向" (Beijing Normal University 1959: 151).

whereas now (in her time, R.C.) it could directly follow nouns, or verb-object-compounds, or even phrases, instead of only adjectives (Li 1962: 48).

Kubler, like Li Chi, discussed the adverbial marker and its extended use, which consisted in adverbs becoming longer than ever before and in the addition of the adverbial marker *de* 地 to words that were already adverbs (Kubler 1985: 58f.).

Gunn treated the adverbial constructions + *de* 地/的 in the section on Euro-Japanese features since 1918, because up to 1918 "most adverbial constructions were formed by words lexically defined as adverbs or by reduplicated syllables" (Gunn 1991: 264), pointing out that the vernacular was even then "quite flexible in allowing virtually any *preformed idiomatic* phrase or syntactic construction to be affixed to *de* or *di* (的 or 地) to form an adverbial phrase" (ibd., emphasis by Gunn). He saw new adverbial constructions clearly influenced by literal translations from Japanese and European languages. He recognized three different forms of innovative adverbial constructions: a) *hěn* 很 + Adj./SV + *de* 的/地, b) substantive + *de* 的/地, and c) syntactic constructions and strings of phrases of no preformed, fixed idiomatic or morphological origin + *de* 的/地 (Gunn 1991: 265).

Xie Yaoji described the "clear division" of the structural particles *de* 的/地/得, as syntactic markers of attributes, adverbials and complements respectively, to be one facet of the "morphological change of words".[118] He is the only one of the authors cited in this chapter who includes the complement particle *de* 得 in his discussion of *de*.

According to He Yang, the difference between adverbs marked with *de* 地/的 before and after May Fourth lay in the structure of adjectives and verbs functioning as adverbs. He argued that in old *báihuà* used before May Fourth, *de* 地/的 could only be added to complex (reduplicated, suffixed etc.) adjective forms like *mànmànrde* 慢慢儿的 ("slowly") or *zuìxūnxūnde* 醉醺醺的 ("drunk", "tipsy"), while after May Fourth it could

---

[118] "词的形态变化，结构助词'的、地、得'要明确分工，依次作定语、状语和补语的语法形式标志；[...]" (Xie 2001: 18).

also be added to simple adjective forms (He 2008: 174-176). Similar is the case with verbs, which originally could not serve as adverbs at all, but *de* might be added to reduplicated or suffixed verbs like *yáoyáode* 搖搖的 ("shaky") or *xiàoxīxīde* 笑嘻嘻的 ("grinning", "smiling"), while after May Fourth the use of *de* following simple verb forms slowly increased (He 2008: 177). Implicitly he contradicted Li Chis assertion that *de* "was usually reserved strictly for words that were adverbs" (Li 1962: 46).

The most interesting questions therefore would concern, on the one hand, changes in the structure of adverbs marked by *de* 地 or its graphic precursor *de* 的, in the degree of their complexity in different periods, and in the word classes used as adverbials, and on the other hand their frequency; but they will not be investigated in this thesis. The establishment and subsequent increase of the adverbial marker written as *de* 地 will be illustrated in chapter 5.4.2.

### 5.2.2.2  *Increase of passive marker bèi* 被

Different aspects have been put forward concerning the passive marker *bèi* 被, one regarding its increase, another regarding the presence or absence of an agent, the third regarding its semantic extension. As the latter is a subject of the next chapter on semantic changes (see chapter 5.3.1), only the former two, related to syntactic changes, will be discussed here. Of course both aspects are closely related, because any semantic extension of *bèi* 被 passive sentences would result in its more frequent use.

Many authors on 'Europeanization' only mention the semantic extension of *bèi* 被 passive sentences, but not expressively its increased use. Kubler additionally notices a shift from "a large number of markers besides *bèi*" that were "formerly available to make passive voice explicit" to *bèi* 被, having taken precedence since the beginning of Western influence (Kubler 1985: 89). Peyraube agrees that the increase of *bèi*-passives has been real, but holds that it soon stabilized or was even rejected (Peyraube 2000: 12). He Yang sees a clear, though unevenly distributed, increase of passive voice in different contemporary written registers compared to the novels of Ming and Qing dynasties (He Yang 2008: 241f.).

As regards Kublers estimation that one of the new developments in the use of *bèi* 被 was the liberty to omit the agent, Peyraube argued that "during the Tang period [...] the ‚*bei* + Agent + Verb' form started to become common" (Peyraube 2000: 6), whereas before that time "*bèi* 被 was used directly before the verb without any agent" (Peyraube 2000: 6f.).

The following table shows the numbers in which *bèi* 被 passive sentences increased and the respective proportion of agents expressed.

**Table 5-19: Number of passive marker *bèi* 被 and percentage of agent expressed**

|  |  | narrative prose Chinese | average | narrative prose translated | average | essays | average | newspaper | average | total | average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| passive marker *bèi* 被 | Period I | 10 | 3.3 | 9 | 1.8 | -- | -- | 24 | 5.3 | 43 | 3.4 |
|  | Period II | 14 | 2.8 | 3 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.3 | 14 | 3.1 | 32 | 1.7 |
|  | Period III | 32 | 6.4 | 12 | 2.4 | 17 | 3.4 | 50 | 10.0 | 111 | 5.6 |
|  | Period IV | 18 | 4.5 | 7 | 1.8 | 11 | 3.7 | 12 | 2.4 | 48 | 3.0 |
|  | Period V | 16 | 4.0 | 23 | 4.6 | 28 | 5.6 | 11 | 2.2 | 78 | 4.1 |
|  | **in all** | **90** | **4.3** | **54** | **2.3** | **57** | **3.4** | **111** | **4.6** | **312** | **3.6** |
| thereof with agent expressed | Period I | 10 | 3.3 | 3 | 0.6 | -- | -- | 9 | 2.0 | 22 | 1.8 |
|  | Period II | 12 | 2.4 | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.9 | 18 | 1.0 |
|  | Period III | 23 | 4.6 | 9 | 1.8 | 11 | 2.2 | 20 | 4.0 | 63 | 3.2 |
|  | Period IV | 9 | 2.3 | 4 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.4 | 15 | 0.9 |
|  | Period V | 7 | 1.8 | 14 | 2.8 | 14 | 2.8 | 3 | 0.6 | 38 | 2.0 |
|  | **in all** | **61** | **2.9** | **31** | **1.3** | **26** | **1.5** | **38** | **1.6** | **156** | **1.8** |
| agent expressed / omitted by period in percent | Period I | 100% / 0% | | 33% / 67% | | -- | | 38% / 62% | | 51% / 49% | |
|  | Period II | 86% / 14% | | 33% / 67% | | 100% / 0% | | 29% / 71% | | 56% / 44% | |
|  | Period III | 72% / 28% | | 75% / 25% | | 65% / 35% | | 40% / 60% | | 57% / 43% | |
|  | Period IV | 50% / 50% | | 57% / 43% | | 0% / 100% | | 17% / 83% | | 31% / 69% | |
|  | Period V | 44% / 56% | | 61% / 39% | | 50% / 50% | | 27% / 73% | | 49% / 51% | |
|  | **in all** | **68% / 32%** | | **57% / 43%** | | **46% / 54%** | | **34% / 66%** | | **50% / 50%** | |

The largest number of passive marker *bèi* 被 is to be found in period III newspapers (containing 45% of all occurrences in period III), which is also the register most

abundant in *bèi* 被 passive markers, followed by "narrative prose Chinese". The lowest rate is to be found in "narrative prose translated", where additionally the peak is not in period III, like it is in "narrative prose Chinese" and in "newspaper", but later on in period V (with nearly twice as many occurrences as in period III, 2.5 as many as in period I). Comparing the total numbers in the four registers, 32% of the passive markers occur in "newspaper", 29% in "narrative prose Chinese", 23% in "essays", 16% in "narrative prose translated". This circumstance suggests that the increased use of the passive marker *bèi* 被 is not primarily due to the influence of translations. For the registers "narrative prose Chinese" and "newspaper", as well as for the entirety of the registers, Peyraube was right in assuming that the increase of the earlier years would not continue. But the use of *bèi* 被 did increase continuously in "essays" and discontinuously in "narrative prose translated", although here on a rather low level. Striking is also the decrease in "newspaper" after period III to a level considerably below those in periods I and II.

Regarding the question of expressed or omitted agents in *bèi*-sentences, there is a clear increase of sentences omitting the agent only in "narrative prose Chinese", whereas in the two registers "essays" and "newspaper" the agent was most frequently omitted in period IV, and in "narrative prose translated" in periods I and II.

### 5.2.2.3   Auxiliary *zài* 在 for progressive aspect

The extended use of the locative preposition *zài* 在 was discussed already by Wang Li (see chapter 5.2.3.1). Its use as marker for the progressive aspect, alone or together with the aspect particle *zhe* 着, was mentioned only by Cornelius Kubler and Edward Gunn.

Kubler saw this use of *zài* 在 as "another example of Europeanized grammar in Chinese" rapidly increasing (Kubler 1985: 99). He held that sentences like *Wǒ zài lái* 我在来 (I am coming), *Nǐ zài shuō shénme?* 你在说什么？ (What are you saying?) or *Tā zài chī fàn* 他在吃饭 (He is eating) were now "common both in speech and, especially, in writing" (ibd.), but in traditional Chinese "would either not have had any progressive aspect marker or used some other means to indicate progression" (ibd.). As one possible

explanation of great importance he saw the influence of translations, "in which *zài* came to be used as a conventional rendering of the English present progressive tense with *be* + *-ing*" with *zài* translating "be" (Kubler 1985: 100). As a second possible influence he saw English classes in China with their teaching method of mechanical translation (Kubler 1985: 100f.). As third possible reason he mentioned influence from other Chinese dialects: "In the Southern Min dialects such as Taiwanese, a verbal auxiliary *tèq* is used immediately preceding the main verb of a sentence to indicate continuing action, [...]" (Kubler 1985: 101), adding that "[w]hen speakers of these dialects speak Mandarin, they tend to use *zài* in those positions where *tèq* would occur." (ibd.)

A very similar method to indicate durative aspect, by putting "the equivalent of *zai*, 勒拉 or 来□,[119] before the verb" (Gunn 1991: 191), was mentioned by Gunn as a feature of Wu dialect. Whether this construction or the contraction of *zhèngzài* 正在[120] or of *zài nàr/nàli* 在那儿/那里 (Gunn 1991: 190) are the sources of this usage of *zài* 在, Gunn classed it as "indigenous innovation since 1918" rather than as Europeanized feature like Kubler suggested.[121]

---

[119] The missing character should be [口朵], which is not part of the available set of Chinese characters.

[120] As assumed by Ōta Tatsuo (1958 [1981]: 276), cited by Gunn 1991: 190.

[121] Of a similar opinion is Zhang Jie in his 2011 article on "Pǔtōnghuà fuci ‚zai' yuanliu kaobian 普通话副词"在"源流考辨", where he argues that the adverbial use of *zài* 在 to mark the durative aspect did not develop from *zhèngzài* 正在, but made its way into Pǔtōnghuà from Southern Chinese dialects with the help of authors from dialect areas in Southern China, especially Wu (Zhang 2011: 76-81).

**Table 5-20:** *(zhèng)zài* (正)在 ... *(zhe)* 着 **as marker for progressive aspect**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | average | | average | | average | | average | | average |
| *(zhèng) zài* (正) 在 + verb | Period I | 1 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.2 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.2 |
| | Period II | 11 | 2.2 | 6 | 1.2 | 2 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.2 | 20 | 1.1 |
| | Period III | 31 | 6.2 | 13 | 2.6 | 10 | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 2.7 |
| | Period IV | 23 | 5.8 | 21 | 5.3 | 23 | 7.7 | 10 | 2.0 | 77 | 4.8 |
| | Period V | 21 | 5.3 | 18 | 3.6 | 16 | 3.2 | 10 | 2.0 | 65 | 3.4 |
| | **in all** | **87** | **4.1** | **59** | **2.5** | **51** | **3.0** | **21** | **0.9** | **218** | **2.5** |
| thereof *(zhèng) zài* (正) 在 + verb + *zhe* 着 | Period I | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Period II | 2 | 0.4 | 2 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0.2 |
| | Period III | 8 | 1.6 | 5 | 1.0 | 5 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0.9 |
| | Period IV | 3 | 0.8 | 3 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.7 | 2 | 0.4 | 10 | 0.6 |
| | Period V | 1 | 0.3 | 2 | 0.4 | 3 | 0.6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0.3 |
| | **in all** | **14** | **0.7** | **12** | **0.5** | **10** | **0.6** | **2** | **0.1** | **38** | **0.4** |

Regarding the numbers, Kubler was right as far as period IV in the registers "narrative prose translated" and "essays" as well as in the total; in "newspaper" there were as near as no occurrences in periods I to III, *zài* 在 indicating the progressive aspect only emerging in periods IV and V. But in "narrative prose Chinese" the peak was reached in period III already, the decline in periods IV and V being as steady (though not as pronounced) as the increase in periods II to III. Even though most *zài* 在 + Verb appear in "narrative prose Chinese", the highest single result is in "essays" in period III. Contrary to Kubler's assumption, however, only 24% of all occurrences appear in "narrative prose translated", putting this register on third position after "narrative prose Chinese" (39%) and "essays" (29%).

The proportions for *zài* 在 + Verb + *zhe* 着 are similar, (narrative prose Chinese 37%, essays 32%, narrative prose translated 26%, newspaper 5%), although in this case the peak is one period earlier.

## 5.2.3  Prepositional phrases

Wang Li takes an easy option when he writes about the "Europeanization of connective elements", quite simply subsuming under this term what by others (before as well as after, cf. Kupfer 1979: 75-110) had been, following European school grammar, divided into "conjunction" and "preposition" or "coverb".[122] Concerning the latter, it was probably Charles Hockett who in 1945 used the term "co-verb" for the first time in his *Dictionary of Spoken Chinese*.[123] As Chinese prepositions are of verbal origin,[124] and some are still homophonous and homographic with Modern Chinese verbs, calling them "coverbs" according to their historical origin is as legitimate as calling them "prepositions" according to their contemporary function (cf. Li and Thompson 1974 and 1981). Although "coverb" probably comes closer to Chinese speakers' *Sprachgefühl* and takes into account the sometimes uncertain position of this word class inside the verb-preposition continuum, the term "preposition" has also its justification. Historically, it originates from the legitimate wish to revalue the Chinese language "which has no grammar"[125] by allowing it each grammatical item found in European languages. This wish, by the way, resulted at least as much in Europeanized linguistic terminology as in Europeanized language. Functionally, Chinese prepositions (or coverbs) work in about the same way as English or German prepositions (which are, more precisely, adpositions, as there are some post-, circum- and ambipositions in these

---

[122] If they had been divided. About this question, see the complaint by the authors of Beijing Normal University in 1959: "In old Báihuà, there are some function words [...] like '*yǔ*', '*hé*', '*tóng*', '*hé*' etc., but there is no definite specification whether they are prepositions or conjunctions." ("在旧白話中，有些虛字 [...] 如"與"、"和"、"同"、"合"等，它們是介詞还是連詞，並沒有一定規格。") (Beijing Normal University 1959: 144).

[123] This is what Charles N. Li and Sandra A. Thompson assume in their 1974 article on "Co-verbs in Mandarin Chinese: Verbs or Prepositions?" (*JoCL* 2.3, 257-278). The bibliographical data they give for Hockett is: Hockett, Charles, Chao-Ying Fang, et al. (1945): *Dictionary of Spoken Chinese*. Washington, D.C.: War Department Technical Manual, 30-933.

[124] This holds true not only for Classical Chinese (see Unger, Ulrich (1995): *Grammatik des Klassischen Chinesisch. I. Teil: Wort, Syntagma*. Münster (unveröffentl. 3., unveränderte, Auflage (20 Ex.)), but also for Modern Chinese insofar as the historical origin of the coverbs (or prepositions) is concerned - cf. Li and Thompson 1974: 257-278 as well as Li, Charles N., Sandra A. Thompson (1981): *Mandarin Chinese. A functional reference grammar*. Berkeley [u.a.]: University of California Press, chapter 9: "Coverbs/Pre-positions", pp. 356-369.

[125] Some of the most prominent supporters of this notion are cited by Ramsey, S. Robert (1987): *The Languages of China*. Princeton: Princeton UP, chapter 5 "The Standard (Grammar)", pp. 49-86.

languages) do: They indicate the relation of their referent to all the rest of the sentence.[126] As the "claim for Europeanization" is the core of this thesis, I will stick to "prepositions".

Conjunctions are not prepositions, at least not in European languages. In Chinese, though, there are a couple of conjunctions that are homographic and homophonous with prepositions. I just give two examples here. Compare *hé* 和 as preposition in (1) and as conjunction in (2) as well as *gēn* 跟 as preposition in (3) and as conjunction in (4):

(1) 有　　事　　要　　**和**　群众　　　商量。
*Yǒu　shì　yào　**hé**　qúnzhòng　shāngliang.*
have　event　must　**with**　masses　　talk-over
If problems arise, they have to be discussed with the masses.

(2) 工人　　　**和**　　　农民
*Gōngrén　**hé**　　nóngmín*
Workers　**and**　farmers[127]

(3) 你　去　**跟**　老王　　　研究　　　一下。
*Nǐ　qù　**gēn**　Lǎo Wáng　yánjiū　yíxià.*
You　go　**with**　Old Wang　consider　once
You just go and consider that with Old Wang.

(4) 小李　　**跟**　我　都　是　山西人。
*Xiǎo Lǐ　**gēn**　wǒ　dōu　shì　Shānxī rén.*
Little Li　**and**　I　all　are　Shanxi people
Little Li and I are both from Shanxi.[128]

---

[126] The original description of "co-verb" by Hockett as cited by Li and Thompson 1974 runs: "Co-verbs serve to mark nominal referents in a sentence, either (1) connecting the following nominal referent to a preceding one, or (2) indicating the relation of the following nominal referent to all the rest of the sentence." (Hockett et al. 1945: 18, cited by Li and Thompson 1974: 258). I omitted "nominal", because prepositions in large are not limited to heading nominal referents (cf. Jaworska, E. (1994): Prepositions and Prepositional Phrases. In: R.E. Asher (Hg.): The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, Oxford [u.a.]: Pergamon Press, 3303-3309, here: 3304).

[127] Examples and classification as preposition or conjunction by Lü 1996: 231f., translation by me.

[128] Examples and classification by Lü 1996: 201f., translation by me.

In the first of the following two chapters I will take a close look at *zài* 在, which is the most thoroughly discussed preposition (but at least is undoubtedly a preposition, or coverb, if this term were to be preferred). The second chapter is dedicated to the remainder of prepositions. For technical reasons, the quantitative analysis in that chapter will also include conjunctions that are homographic with the prepositions discussed there. The other conjunctions, mostly clause connecting, will be the subject of chapter 5.2.4.1.

### 5.2.3.1 *Zài* 在 *in locative and temporal phrases*

Besides the use of *zài* 在 as auxiliary for the progressive aspect (see chapter 5.2.2.3), different authors discussed different aspects of *zài* 在 in prepositional phrases. One aspect, the addition of *zài* 在 to locative or temporal phrases, was discussed by Wang Li, Li Chi, Xie Yaoji, and He Yang. Another aspect, the position of the locative phrase (with *zài* 在 added) preceding or following the main verb of a sentence was discussed by Kubler, Gunn and Peyraube. The motives for the first group of authors, who are Chinese native speakers, to focus on the first aspect and for the second group of authors, who are not Chinese native speakers, to focus on the second aspect is worth an educated guess.[129]

#### 5.2.3.1.1 *The addition of zài* 在 *to locative or temporal phrases*

Wang Li, after observing that in Europeanized texts "connective elements" would generally be more numerous, mentioned the borrowing of verbs like *zài* 在 ("exist", "be at/in/on") and *dāng* 当 ("act as", "be equal to", see chapter 5.2.3.2) to form equivalents for English prepositions as one of three ways in which "connective elements" (*liánjié chéngfèn* 联结成分) could be treated in Europeanized Chinese texts (cf. *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 359). In Chinese, *zài* 在 would "of course be a 100% verb" (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985:

---

[129] I suspect that the first group of authors, being familiar with earlier stages of Chinese as well as sensitive to diachronic changes, paid at the same time less attention to regional variation, which could be explained by the prevalent view on the Chinese language among Chinese intellectuals at that time. The position of the *zài*-phrase was of less interest to them. The second group of authors, coming from a non-Chinese background, put their focus instead on the application of syntactical rules, which might correspond better to the non-native speaker's approach to a language.

362), but lacking appropriate translations for English prepositions like "in" or "on", the verb *zài* 在 would be borrowed to fill in the gap opened up by Europeanized linguistic usage (ibid.). So, where formerly the noun followed by a postposition would have sufficed to form a locative phrase, it needed to be complemented by a preposed *zài* 在 in Europeanized texts, like Wang Li showes in two illustrative examples taken from *Hóng lóu mèng*, Europeanizing them by adding *zài* 在 in front:

(A) 咱们 （在） 雪 下 吟 诗。

*Zánmen (zài) xuě* **xià** *yín shī.*

we_incl. (in/at/on) snow **under** recite poetry

"We recite poems in the snow."[130]

(B) 凭 你 （在） 主子 前 辩 去。

*Píng nǐ (zài) zhǔzi* **qián** *biàn qu.*

no-matter you (in/at/on) master **front** argue go

"And you go and explain this in front of the master."[131]

In his complementary work *Zhōngguó yǔfǎ lǐlùn* Wang Li listed all combinations of *zài* 在 and locative postpositions as Chinese equivalents for English locative prepositions, explaining that in translations it was inevitable to use *zài* 在 and after the noun the corresponding "locative word" (*fāngwèi de zìyǎn* 方位的字眼) (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 472).

Besides, *zài* 在 could, like *dāng* 当, also function as temporal preposition translating English "when" (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 363). Even though the temporal phrase would still need to be ended by *shí* 时 or *de shíhou* 的 时候, *zài* 在 or *dāng* 当 (see next chapter 5.2.3.2) would fill the gap in front of the temporal phrase opened up by English linguistic usage.

---

[130] Yang Xianyi and Gladys Yang translate "Writing poems in the snow?" (Cao, Xueqin, Gao E; Yang Xianyi, Gladys Yang (tr.) (2003): 红楼梦 *Hong lou meng. A dream of red mansions. Chinese-English edition.* Beijing 北京: Waiyu chubanshe, p. 1097.

[131] Here Yang Xianyi and Gladys Yang translate "... and you can explain it to the mistresses." (ibd., p. 1785). The two examples, with added *zài* 在, appear in *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 362.

While Wang Li attributed the emergence of *zài* 在 as part of locative phrases to the influence of English prepositions, Li Chi saw it as a result of the "tendency to develop grammatical completeness" (Li 1962: 51) that had started in 1919.[132] She mentioned *zài* 在 in locative phrases, but not the use of *zài* 在 as addition to temporal phrases with *shí(hou)* 时(候). Instead, she pointed out the new usage of *tóngshí* 同时:

> Traditionally *t'ung-shih*, meaning "at the same time" or "in the meantime", was a pure conjunction [sic]. The new use is to make it the object of *ti* 的 so that it becomes "at the same time that..." with a long modifier headed by the preposition *tsai* 在. (Li 1962: 58f.)[133]

She also held that

> [t]he abandonment of the traditional usage of *t'ung-shih* in favor of the new usage [in the form of *zài* 在... *tóngshí* 同时] is another indication of the present preference for the periodic sentence to the loose sentence. (Li 1962: 59)

Gunn suspected this construction to be "invented as an analogue of the Japanese expression" *to dōji ni* と同時に ("at the same time as") (Gunn 1991: 228). Gunn did not give any suggestions concerning the origin of the Japanese expression. Anyhow, as the Japanese expression works without a phrase initial preposition, the idea to put *zài* 在 in front cannot be attributed to Japanese influence.

---

[132] Literally, she stated that "[a]n expression as 'in the city of Peking' should be *tsai Pei-ching ch'eng-li* 在北京城裡 but in days before 1919 ellipsis of the preposition was usual and proper" (Li 1962: 51), but did not explain whether this expression could or should have used *zài* 在 before 1919, or if it should use *zài* 在 in the language of 1962.

[133] The example she gave as an illustration is "會議**在**集中揭發和批判資產階級個人主義思想的**同時**，曝露出漢族幹部過去在民族問題上的自覺的或不自覺的資產階級大民族主義思想，還是相當嚴重的..." (emphasis added by R.C.), translating this as "At the same time that the meeting was exposing and condemning the ideology of capitalistic individualism, it also reveals that in the past, Chinese cadres still held to a quite serious degree, consciously or unconsciously, the ideology of chauvinism". Her example is from *Renmin ribao* 人民日報, Aug. 1st, 1955 (ibd.). Other authors classify *tóngshí* 同时 not as a conjunction, but rather as an adverb, e.g. Hou 1998: 556.

Xie Yaoji (2001: 18) mentioned in his short article only the great increase in the use of prepositions, analogous to the frequent and obligatory use in 'foreign languages', as well as a shift from "optional" to "mandatory", "like '*zài* 在...' (equivalent to 'in, on, at') [...]".[134]

He Yang, after analysing his corpora, ascertained that the use of *zài* 在 with temporal expressions at the head of sentences did increase considerably, and most salient in English-Chinese translations (cf. He 2008: 132f.), but the use of *zài* 在 with locative expressions at the head of existence sentences did increase only insignificantly (cf. He 2008: 135f.). However, his findings are not fully comparable to the statements of Wang Li, Li Chi and Xie Yaoji, as the focus of his investigations differs from their's.

*5.2.3.1.2    Position of the prepositional phrase with zài 在*

The other aspect, discussed by the Western authors, is the position of the prepositional phrase with *zài* 在. In the beginning of his corresponding chapter, Kubler classed "the new position with respect to the main verb of a sentence of the coverb-postverb *zài* [...]" as "[a]nother example of Europeanized Chinese grammar" (Kubler 1985: 102). According to him, the possible shift of locative phrases with *zài* 在 in sentences, where the main verb has more than one syllable or an object, from its position "[a]ccording to the rules of traditionalChinese grammar"[135] (ibid.) in front of the main verb to a position following the main verb, was due to "the influence of Western languages, where adverbial phrases of location normally follow the main verb" (ibid.). However, he also found an alternative explanation besides 'Europeanization' for this shift: He thought it possible that "the new ordering [...] has been influenced not only by foreign languages but also by literary Chinese" (ibid. 105), where "the verb *yú* [no character given, R.C.], which corresponds to Mandarin *zài*, regularly follows the main verb of a sentence" (ibid. 105-6).

---

[134] "外语多用、须用介词，汉语介词的应用，由"随便"转为"需要"，例如"在..."（相当于"in, on, at"）[...]，便大量使用起来。" (Xie 2001: 18).

[135] Kubler referred repeatedly to "traditional Chinese grammar" without making explicit which grammar of what stage or what variety he meant.

Also Gunn pointed out that other influences besides European languages might be responsible for the variation in the position of locative phrases with *zài* 在. He suspected the source to be in the Wu dialect, though encouraged by European influence (Gunn 1991: 246). Peyraube argued that the prepositional phrase with *zài* 在 (meaning the locative phrase, but not the temporal phrase, R.C.) could follow the main verb of a sentence instead of preceding it not only in "today's Southern Mandarin" (Peyraube 2000: 7) but also in Medieval Chinese (ibid. p. 8).

Although a comparison between the numbers of locative phrases with *zài* 在 preceding and following the main verb of a sentence, preferably in relation to the authors' linguistic background, would help to answer the question of diffusion, this question remains to be tackled in later investigation.

**Table 5-21: Locative and temporal phrases with *zài* 在, any position**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | average | narrative prose translated | average | essays | average | newspaper | average | total | average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| locative phrase: *zài* 在 (+ noun) + locative word | Period I | 31 | *10.3* | 44 | *8.8* | -- | *--* | 6 | *1.3* | 81 | *6.5* |
| | Period II | 91 | *18.2* | 66 | *13.2* | 56 | *14.0* | 16 | *3.6* | 229 | *12.4* |
| | Period III | 143 | *28.6* | 110 | *22.0* | 92 | *18.4* | 39 | *7.8* | 384 | *19.2* |
| | Period IV | 116 | *29.0* | 99 | *24.8* | 87 | *29.0* | 148 | *29.6* | 450 | *28.1* |
| | Period V | 104 | *26.0* | 154 | *30.8* | 124 | *24.8* | 103 | *20.6* | 485 | *25.5* |
| | **in all** | **485** | *23.1* | **473** | *19.7* | **359** | *21.1* | **312** | *13.0* | **1,629** | *18.9* |
| temporal phrase: *zài* + *(de) shi(hou)* 在 ... (的) 时 (侯) | Period I | 2 | *0.7* | 8 | *1.6* | -- | *--* | 0 | *0* | 10 | *0.8* |
| | Period II | 11 | *2.2* | 10 | *2.0* | 6 | *1.5* | 3 | *0.7* | 30 | *1.6* |
| | Period III | 22 | *4.4* | 9 | *1.8* | 19 | *3.8* | 7 | *1.4* | 57 | *2.9* |
| | Period IV | 4 | *1.0* | 10 | *2.5* | 11 | *3.7* | 8 | *1.6* | 33 | *2.1* |
| | Period V | 10 | *2.5* | 14 | *2.8* | 7 | *1.4* | 7 | *1.4* | 38 | *2.0* |
| | **in all** | **49** | *2.3* | **51** | *2.1* | **43** | *2.5* | **25** | *1.0* | **168** | *2.0* |

In contrast to He Yangs findings, the majority of locative or temporal phrases preceded by *zài* 在 is in this corpus not to be found in "narrative prose translated", which comes

only third (26% each) after "narrative prose Chinese" (30%) and "essays" (27%) in the case of locative phrases, or "essays" (32%) and "narrative prose" (29%) in the case of temporal phrases. Still, the distance between the average numbers in the first three registers is quite small compared to the two average numbers in the "newspaper" register (17% and 13% respectively). On the other hand, it is the "newspaper" register that has the highest single number of locative phrases with *zài* 在 in period IV – mostly in the figurative sense, an indication of period IV's highly formalized political slang.[136]

Locative phrases headed by *zài* 在 appear most frequently in period IV in three of four registers as well as in the total, but not in "narrative prose translated", where they increase continuously from period I to V. Temporal phrases headed by *zài* 在 do not show the same homogenous pattern, and are much less frequent than locative phrases, amounting only to about one tenth of the latter. In the entirety of the samples there are seven instances of *zài...de tóngshí* 在...的同时 – one outlier in „narrative prose Chinese" in period V and six cases in "newspaper", two of them in period IV, the rest in period V.

Concerning the time of emergence, Li Chi was likely right in stating that from 1919 on there was a new sensitivity for grammatical completeness, but this does not mean that there were no instances of locative phrases headed by *zài* 在 before that time: after all,

---

[136] The question about the frequency of these structures in important Marxist texts like the *Manifesto* or the *Capital* remains to be investigated in detail. I simply counted locative and temporal phrases with "*zài* ... + locative word" and "*zài* ... + temporal expression" in Chinese translations of the Manifesto and two chapters of the Capital, but could not find out who did these translations at what time and from which language (the first translation of the *Manifesto* by Chen Wangdao in 1920, e.g., was from English and Japanese). The counts of the above mentioned structures are as shown in **Table 5-21 (b):** (the average numbers are per ≈ 5,000 characters/sample)

| | *Manifesto* 共产党宣言 19,590 char. *average* | | *Capital* ch. 2 资本论第二章 5,035 char. *average* | | *Capital* ch. 4 资本论第四章 20,989 char. *average* | | For comparison: Narrative prose Chinese, narrative prose translated, essays and newspaper (av.) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| locative phrase | 106 | 26.5 | 35 | 35 | 178 | 44.5 | 23.1 | 19.7 | 21.1 | 13.0 |
| temporal phrase | 13 | 3.3 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 1.0 |

Table 5-21 (b) shows that locative and temporal phrases with *zài* did indeed occur much more frequently in these three samples of Marxist writing than in any other register investigated in this thesis.

the corpus provides 81 occurrences in period I, 16 in period II prior to 1919 (and 213 after), and an average of 17,5 in the reference samples from *Hóng lóu mèng* and *Ér-nǚ yīngxióng zhuàn*. Only the large bulk appeared after 1919.

### 5.2.3.2    *Other prepositional phrases*

"Borrowing Chinese verbs to form equivalents for English prepositions" was only one of three ways to treat "connective elements" in Europeanized texts (cf. *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 359), and *zài* 在 was not alone subject to this process. As another verb corresponding to an English connective (*liánjiécí* 联结词) Wang Li mentioned *dāng* 当 used for "when". Other "connective elements" he mentioned are *hé* 和 ("with/and"), *érqiě* 而且 ("furthermore, and"), *huò* 或 ("or"), *yīn* 因 ("because"), *suī* 虽 ("though, although"), *zòng* 纵 ("even if, even though"), *ruò* 若 ("if, as if") - these , originally already existing in Chinese, were Europeanized by expanding their use, which is the second of Wang Li's three ways. The third method then was used to form prepositions like *duìyú* 对于 ("(in regard) to, toward, at, for") or *guānyú* 关于 ("about, on, with regard to, concerning") (see above, chapter 5.1.5). Of all the Europeanized connective elements he listed in the according chapters of *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* and *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn*, only *dāng* 当, *hé* 和, *zài* 在, *guānyú* 关于, *jiù* 就 in *jiù* 就...*shuō* 说, *duìyú* 对于 (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 359-364), *yǔ* 与 (additionally in *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 469, 473) are prepositions or both prepositions and conjunctions.

 In Wang Li's Chinese grammar textbook version *Zhōngguó xiàndài yǔfǎ* the "connective elements" are itemized in their Chinese form, in the handbook version *Zhōngguó yǔfǎ lǐlùn* in their English form complemented by their respective Chinese translation(s). Especially in the latter publication he referred frequently to their English usage, including English examples, to explain their function in Europeanized Chinese texts, but even in the former publication, which is usually avoiding English, he made use of some English equivalents. As to the frequency of connective elements, he observed them to be much more numerous in Europeanized texts (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985:

359), though "in the Europeanized mind still seemingly very insufficient" (*Yŭfǎ lǐlùn* 1974: 469).[137]

The authors from Beijing Normal University were, as mentioned before, more concerned about standardization and classification. In their opinion, function words like *yŭ* 与/與 ("with"), *hé* 和 ("with"), *tóng* 同 ("with"), *hé* 合 ("with") etc. were not sufficiently standardized in old *báihuà* and it was not clear if they were prepositions (*jiècí* 介词) or conjunctions (*liáncí* 连词) (Beijing Normal University 1959: 144). They wrote further that after May Fourth, the standardization of these function words had been begun to enhance the explicitness of language (ibid.), but only after Liberation [in 1949, R.C.] the question of how to divide their function had found the proper attention, thanks to the language policy guidance of the Party. As a result, since 1954 *hé* 和 and *tóng* 同 have been used in a consistent way in official documents and normative editorials.[138]

The prepositions discussed by Li Chi are *yú* 於 used in the compound prepositions *guānyú* 關於, *duìyú* 對於 etc., and *zài* 在, which have been dealt with above, as well as *wèi* 為 and *yóuyú* 由於. The meaning of *wèi* 為 as used in the *wèi* 為... *ér* 而- construction she gave as "for", thereby explaining its frequent use in slogans (Li 1962: 56f.). *Yóuyú* 由於 ("because of") she introduced as "[...] another one of these words that may be used both as preposition and a conjunction joining clauses" (Li 1962: 61).

Kubler dedicated one chapter to the use of *dāng* 当 introducing temporal clauses, but did not assign it to a certain word class. After some general considerations, he expressed his presumption that, although rather scarce in Ba Jin's novel *Jia*, "[...] the frequency of occurrence of this pattern must be very much higher in current prose" (Kubler 1985: 121f.).

---

[137] "[...],然而在欧化的脑筋里还是显得很不够的。" (*Yŭfǎ lǐlùn* 1974: 469).

[138] "全国解放以后，在党的语言政策指导下，这个問題才开始真正地被重视起来。从 1954 年起，在許多正式的文件中和一些典范的社論中[...]，"和"和"同"的这种分工原则才真正得到了普遍的貫彻。" (Beijing Normal University 1959: 145).

Also Gunn mentioned the use of *wèi* 为... *ér* 而 ("on behalf of / for"), but focussed on its conversion to the "[...] more vernacular sounding *weile ... er* and similar variants [...]" (Gunn 1991: 202). His discussion of "Chinese *yu* as an Analogue to Japanese *ni*" (Gunn 1991: 217) is part of chapter 5.1.5. The conversion of verb phrases to the coverbs *tōngguò* 通过 ("to go through"/"by (means/way of)"), *wéirào* 围绕 ("to surround"/ "around") and *zuòwéi* 作为 ("to be, to act as"/"as") is part of his section on "New syntactic configurations" (Gunn 1991: 233f.).

Xie Yaoji drew the concise conclusion that Indo-European hypotaxis also increased the frequency of conjunctions in Chinese, especially of "*hé* 和", which because of its similarity to English "and" became indispensable.[139] The same happened to prepositions which, because they are both frequent and indispensable in foreign languages [sic: *wàiyǔ* 外语], turned from "optional" to "mandatory" (see above 5.2.3.1 and Xie 2001: 18) and became much more frequent (ibid.). For prepositions he gave the two examples *zài* 在 (as equivalent to "in, on, at" etc.) and *dāng* 当 in *dāng* 当 ... *de shíhou* 的时候 (as equivalent to "when, while") already mentioned by Wang Li.[140]

In the section "Extension of application range and frequency increase of prepositions" (He 2008: 127-142) He Yang took *zài* 在 and *dāng* 当 as the main - and only - examples. He generally saw an increase in the frequency of prepositions and conjunctions after May Fourth.

**Prepositions in the corpus samples**

In counting the occurrences of these prepositions in the corpus samples to test the different authors' assumptions that, as a result of the 'Europeanization' of written Chinese grammar, the frequency of prepositions (as one part of connective elements) had increased, some restrictions have to be taken into account. Most Chinese

---

[139] "印欧系语言注重形合，汉语的连词也多用起来，其中"和"跟英语"and"用法因看作相同而　变得不可缺少，[...]" (Xie 2001: 18).

[140] "外语多用、须用介词，汉语介词的应用，由"随便"转为"需要"，例如"在..."（相当于 "in, on, at" 等）、"当...的时候"（相当于 "when, while"）[...]，便大量使用起来。" (Xie 2001: 18).

prepositions are homographic with conjunctions, verbs or other words,[141] as mentioned in 5.2.3, so that the characters used for writing them appear also as other morphemes. To lower the rate of erroneous findings, the most frequent (> 9 tokens) words or compounds containing the character in question, have been excluded. In the following I give some examples: *Dāng* 当 was counted without *gǎndāng* 敢当 ("dare to take on a responsibility"), *yīngdāng* 应当 ("should, ought to"), *xiāngdāng* 相当 ("correspond to"), *dāngrán* 当然 ("certainly"); time expressions with *dāng* 当, like *dāngshí* 当时 ("at that time"), *dāngrì* 当日 ("the same day"), *dāngyè* 当夜 ("that night") etc. were counted separately. *Gēn* 跟 was counted without *gēn zài* 跟在 ("follow at"), *gēnzhe* 跟着 ("follow + progressive aspect marker"), *gēnzōng* 跟踪 ("track/tail after"), *hé* 和 without *gònghé* 共和 ("republic"), *nuǎnhuo* 暖和 ("mild, warm"), *héshang* 和尚 ("Buddhist monk") and *hépíng* 和平 ("peace"), *hé* 合 without *bù hé* 不合 ("should/ought not"), *jiéhé* 结合 ("combine"), *liánhé* 联合 ("unite"), *pèihé* 配合 ("coordinate"), *zōnghé* 综合 ("synthesize"), *héfǎ* 合法 ("legitimate"), *hélǐ* 合理 ("reasonable"), *hétóng* 合同 ("agreement"), *hézuò* 合作 ("cooperate"), *jí* 及 without *yǐji* 以及 ("as well as", "along with", "and"), *bùjí* 不及 ("not as good as", "inferior to"), *Āijí* 埃及 ("Egypt"), *jíqí* 及其 ("and"), *jíshí* 及时 ("timely", "in time"), *jízhì* 及至 ("up to", "until"), *tóng* 同 without *hétong* 合同 ("agreement"), *bùtóng* 不同 ("different"), *gòngtóng* 共同 ("common", "mutual"), *xiāngtóng* 相同 ("identical", "alike"), *péitóng* 陪同 ("accompany"), *tóngzhì* 同志 ("comrade"), *tóngxué* 同学 ("fellow student"), and so on.

---

[141] To give only one example: The character 和 used for writing the preposition "with" is also used to write the verb "harmonize", the stative verb "mild", the nouns "sum" and "peace", as well as the conjunction "and", all pronounced *hé*, and as the verb *huó* "mix with water, knead" , the verb *huò* "mix", and the measure word *huò* for "changes of water". Additionally, it writes the front part of *héshang* 和尚 "Buddhist monk". The chances for hitting upon 和 *huò* "mix" in so small a corpus as the one at hand might be negligible, but "peace" and "mild" as well as the Buddhist monk are quite common. Therefore words containing the character in any of the other senses should be excluded from the counts.

**Table 5-22:** *Dāng* 当 **in** *dāng* 当 *... de shíhou* 的时候 **as equivalent for "when", in other temporal expressions (***e.g. dāngshí* 当时***,*** *dāngrì* 当日***,*** *dāngyè* 当夜**), and without explicit temporal reference (including all other uses of the character)**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | average | | average | | average | | average | | average |
| *dāng* 当 *...* *de shíhou* 的时候 | Period I | 2 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 1 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.2 |
| | Period II | 2 | 0.4 | 6 | 1.2 | 4 | 1.0 | 1 | 0.2 | 13 | 0.7 |
| | Period III | 6 | 1.2 | 8 | 1.6 | 5 | 1.0 | 4 | 0.8 | 23 | 1.2 |
| | Period IV | 5 | 1.3 | 13 | 3.3 | 2 | 0.7 | 3 | 0.6 | 23 | 1.4 |
| | Period V | 2 | 0.5 | 6 | 1.2 | 2 | 0.4 | 2 | 0.4 | 12 | 0.6 |
| | **in all** | **17** | **0.8** | **33** | **1.4** | **13** | **0.8** | **11** | **0.5** | **74** | **0.9** |
| *dāng* 当 in other temporal expressions | Period I | 6 | 2.0 | 5 | 1.0 | -- | -- | 1 | 0.2 | 12 | 1.0 |
| | Period II | 11 | 2.2 | 13 | 2.6 | 3 | 0.8 | 4 | 0.9 | 31 | 1.7 |
| | Period III | 10 | 2.0 | 9 | 1.8 | 6 | 1.2 | 7 | 1.4 | 32 | 1.6 |
| | Period IV | 4 | 1.0 | 3 | 0.8 | 9 | 3.0 | 2 | 0.4 | 18 | 1.1 |
| | Period V | 3 | 0.8 | 6 | 1.2 | 17 | 3.4 | 17 | 3.4 | 43 | 2.3 |
| | **in all** | **34** | **1.6** | **36** | **1.5** | **35** | **2.1** | **31** | **1.3** | **136** | **1.6** |
| *dāng* 当 without explicit temporal reference | Period I | 12 | 4.0 | 37 | 7.4 | -- | -- | 29 | 6.4 | 78 | 6.2 |
| | Period II | 28 | 5.6 | 42 | 8.4 | 35 | 8.8 | 25 | 5.6 | 130 | 7.0 |
| | Period III | 6 | 1.2 | 16 | 3.2 | 20 | 4.0 | 41 | 8.2 | 83 | 4.2 |
| | Period IV | 11 | 2.8 | 13 | 3.3 | 8 | 2.7 | 27 | 5.4 | 59 | 3.7 |
| | Period V | 19 | 4.8 | 24 | 4.8 | 14 | 2.8 | 26 | 5.2 | 83 | 4.4 |
| | **in all** | **76** | **3.6** | **132** | **5.5** | **77** | **4.5** | **148** | **6.2** | **433** | **5.0** |

**Table 5-23: Frequency of prepositions (including their homographs)**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | average | narrative prose translated | average | essays | average | newspaper | average | total | average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *gēn* 跟, *hé* 和, *hé* 合, *jí* 及, *jiù* 就, *tóng* 同, *yǔ* 与 | Period I | 141 | 47.0 | 185 | 37.0 | -- | -- | 181 | 40.2 | 507 | 40.6 |
| | Period II | 172 | 34.4 | 164 | 32.8 | 166 | 41.5 | 169 | 37.6 | 671 | 36.3 |
| | Period III | 197 | 39.4 | 208 | 41.6 | 196 | 39.2 | 201 | 40.2 | 802 | 40.1 |
| | Period IV | 168 | 42.0 | 218 | 54.5 | 143 | 47.7 | 411 | 82.2 | 940 | 58.8 |
| | Period V | 155 | 38.8 | 257 | 51.4 | 215 | 43.0 | 329 | 65.8 | 956 | 50.3 |
| | **in all** | **833** | **39.7** | **1032** | **43.0** | **720** | **42.4** | **1291** | **53.8** | **3876** | **45.1** |
| *wèi* 为, *wèile* 为了, *yīn* 因, *yīnwèi* 因为 | Period I | 63 | 21.0 | 198 | 39.6 | -- | -- | 210 | 46.7 | 471 | 37.7 |
| | Period II | 114 | 22.8 | 183 | 36.6 | 121 | 30.3 | 150 | 33.3 | 568 | 30.7 |
| | Period III | 61 | 12.2 | 84 | 16.8 | 89 | 17.8 | 119 | 23.8 | 353 | 17.7 |
| | Period IV | 24 | 6.0 | 34 | 8.5 | 39 | 13.0 | 87 | 17.4 | 184 | 11.5 |
| | Period V | 55 | 13.8 | 68 | 13.6 | 79 | 15.8 | 98 | 19.6 | 300 | 15.8 |
| | **in all** | **317** | **15.1** | **567** | **23.6** | **328** | **19.3** | **664** | **27.7** | **1876** | **21.8** |
| *tōngguò* 通过, *wéirào* 围绕, *zuòwèi* 作为 | Period I | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 3 | 0.7 | 4 | 0.3 |
| | Period II | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.8 | 3 | 0.7 | 8 | 0.4 |
| | Period III | 4 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.4 | 18 | 3.6 | 24 | 1.2 |
| | Period IV | 5 | 1.3 | 2 | 0.5 | 4 | 1.3 | 30 | 6.0 | 41 | 2.6 |
| | Period V | 5 | 1.3 | 7 | 1.4 | 7 | 1.4 | 19 | 3.8 | 38 | 2.0 |
| | **in all** | **16** | **0.8** | **10** | **0.4** | **16** | **0.9** | **73** | **3.0** | **115** | **1.3** |

These numbers, as should be recalled again, do not show the occurrences of prepositions in the corpus samples, but of the characters used to write prepositions as well as other words. Special care has to be taken of the difference between samples written in Literary Chinese and Colloquial Chinese.[142] The character 为 (為), for example, is not only a preposition (or coverb, see above 5.2.3) in both varieties when pronounced *wèi*, but also a common verb in Literary Chinese when pronounced *wéi*, which accounts for its high frequency in those samples: In period I, three of five samples in the "narrative prose translated" register are written in Literary Chinese and

---

[142] For the detailed proportion of Literary Chinese and Colloquial Chinese in the corpus samples as well as the discrimination standard see chapter 4: Corpus.

contain 88% of all occurrences of *wéi/wèi* 为, in period II, two of five samples in "narrative prose translated" are written in Literary Chinese, containing 86% of all occurrences of *wéi/wèi* 为. The same linguistic variation also shows in the frequency of *hé* 和 and *jiù* 就, which are scarce in Literary Chinese, but common in Colloquial Chinese and therefore numerous in those periods and registers where Colloquial Chinese samples predominate.

The use of *dāng* 当 as an equivalent for English "when", followed by ...(*de*) *shí*(*hou*) (的)时(候) is even less frequent than that of *zài* 在...(*de*) *shí*(*hou*) (的)时(候) (see above, 5.2.3.1). On the other hand, *dāng* 当 is through all periods (in "narrative prose Chinese" and "narrative prose translated" rather earlier than in "essays" and "newspaper") quite commonly used in combination with time nouns to form expressions like *dāngshí* 当时 "at that time, then", *dāngrì* 当日 "that very day", *dāngyè* 当夜 "that night" and others. On the whole, *dāng/ dǎng/dàng* 当 is used mostly without explicit temporal reference in different senses - "serve as", "regard as", "occupy a position", "(be) equal", "should", "at the place", "in", "at" and others.

Regarding the second table (table 5-23), only the third group of newly coined prepositions (*tōngguò* 通过, *wéirào* 围绕, *zuòwèi* 作为, see Gunn's description above) did clearly increase, and certainly most clearly in the "newspaper" register. The modal prepositions *hé* 和, *jiù* 就 and others are in three of four registers more frequent in periods IV and V than in I to III, but their frequency increased by comparatively moderate 147% (narrative prose translated), 115% (essays), and salient 204% (newspaper), while it decreased in "narrative prose Chinese" to 83% of period I in period V. The average increase was 89% of period I in period II, 99% in period III, 145% in period IV, followed by a slight reduction to 124% in period V. Noticeable about the second row containing the causal prepositions *wèi* 为, *wèile* 为了, *yīn* 因, and *yīnwèi* 因为 is their lowest frequency of all in period IV. One possible explanation is that by then the number of samples in Literary Chinese with their verbal uses of *wéi* 为 had receded, leaving only samples in Colloquial Chinese containing the preposition *wèi* 为. Another

possible explanation is that in period IV reasoning was out of fashion in favour of campaigning. The detailed counts are:

**Table 5-24: Frequency of *wèi* 为, *wèile* 为了, *yīn* 因, and *yīnwèi* 因为 in detail**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | average | narrative prose translated | average | essays | average | newspaper | average | total | average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *wéi/wèi* 为 | Period I | 49 | 16.3 | 171 | 34.2 | -- | -- | 176 | 39.1 | 396 | 31.7 |
| | Period II | 84 | 16.8 | 162 | 32.4 | 92 | 23.0 | 128 | 28.4 | 466 | 25.2 |
| | Period III | 30 | 6.0 | 41 | 8.2 | 43 | 8.6 | 92 | 18.4 | 206 | 10.3 |
| | Period IV | 10 | 2.5 | 13 | 3.3 | 28 | 9.3 | 62 | 12.4 | 113 | 7.1 |
| | Period V | 27 | 6.8 | 32 | 6.4 | 44 | 8.8 | 80 | 16.0 | 183 | 9.6 |
| | **in all** | **200** | **9.5** | **419** | **17.5** | **207** | **12.2** | **538** | **22.4** | **1364** | **15.9** |
| *wèile* 为了 | Period I | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Period II | 2 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.2 |
| | Period III | 8 | 1.6 | 1 | 0.2 | 4 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.2 | 14 | 0.7 |
| | Period IV | 5 | 1.3 | 4 | 1.0 | 5 | 1.7 | 12 | 2.4 | 26 | 1.6 |
| | Period V | 9 | 2.3 | 9 | 1.8 | 10 | 2.0 | 10 | 2.0 | 38 | 2.0 |
| | **in all** | **24** | **1.1** | **14** | **0.6** | **20** | **1.2** | **23** | **1.0** | **81** | **0.9** |
| *yīn* 因 | Period I | 9 | 3.0 | 25 | 5.0 | -- | -- | 34 | 7.6 | 68 | 5.4 |
| | Period II | 19 | 3.8 | 9 | 1.8 | 12 | 3.0 | 22 | 4.9 | 62 | 3.4 |
| | Period III | 3 | 0.6 | 19 | 3.8 | 8 | 1.6 | 26 | 5.2 | 56 | 2.8 |
| | Period IV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.7 | 2 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.3 |
| | Period V | 2 | 0.5 | 4 | 0.8 | 5 | 1.0 | 5 | 1.0 | 16 | 0.8 |
| | **in all** | **33** | **1.6** | **57** | **2.4** | **27** | **1.6** | **89** | **3.7** | **206** | **2.4** |
| *yīnwèi* 因为 | Period I | 5 | 1.7 | 2 | 0.4 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0.6 |
| | Period II | 9 | 1.8 | 12 | 2.4 | 16 | 4.0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 2.0 |
| | Period III | 20 | 4.0 | 23 | 4.6 | 34 | 6.8 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 3.9 |
| | Period IV | 9 | 2.3 | 17 | 4.3 | 4 | 0.8 | 11 | 2.2 | 41 | 2.6 |
| | Period V | 17 | 4.3 | 23 | 4.6 | 20 | 4.0 | 3 | 0.6 | 63 | 3.3 |
| | **in all** | **60** | **2.9** | **77** | **3.2** | **74** | **4.4** | **14** | **0.6** | **225** | **2.6** |

The reduction of *wéi/wèi* 为 corresponds roughly to an increase of *wèile* 为了, the reduction of *yīn* 因 to the increase of *yīnwèi* 因为. These latter causal prepositions used for justifying and giving reasons are least used in period IV (any political implications?).

138

There is one other preposition that never was suspected of Europeanization, that is *bǎ* 把.The origin of the *bǎ*-construction are certainly not European languages, but the increase of their frequency is still striking, as shows the following table.

**Table 5-25: Frequency of *bǎ* 把**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | average | | average | | average | | average | | average |
| *bǎ* 把 | Period I | 26 | 8.7 | 7 | 1.4 | -- | -- | 2 | 0.4 | 35 | 2.8 |
| | Period II | 41 | 8.2 | 20 | 4.0 | 19 | 4.8 | 3 | 0.7 | 83 | 4.5 |
| | Period III | 93 | 18.6 | 32 | 6.4 | 42 | 8.4 | 2 | 0.4 | 169 | 8.5 |
| | Period IV | 57 | 14.3 | 78 | 19.5 | 34 | 11.3 | 36 | 7.2 | 205 | 12.8 |
| | Period V | 64 | 16.0 | 85 | 17.0 | 47 | 9.4 | 40 | 8.0 | 236 | 12.4 |
| | **in all** | **281** | **13.4** | **222** | **9.3** | **142** | **8.4** | **83** | **3.5** | **728** | **8.5** |

All occurrences incl. classifier and verb

The increase of prepositions is not as obvious as suggested by some of the above mentioned authors. The case of conjunctions, both word connecting and clause or sentence connecting, will be investigated in the next chapter.

## 5.2.4  Clause and sentence

### *5.2.4.1  Conjunctions connecting clauses and sentences, including transposition of subordinative clauses*

It has been said above that Wang Li did not distinguish between prepositions and conjunctions (see chapters 5.2.3 and 5.2.3.2). Today, though, they are differentiated, and the majority of conjunctions does not connect words or phrases, but larger units like clauses, therefore the former have been dealt with in the chapter on prepositional phrases, and the latter are included in this chapter on clause and sentence.

Wang Li distinguishes two different circumstances in the 'Europeanization' of "connective elements" (cf. *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 364). To the first case belong those "connectives that were formerly already existent but facultatively used and now, in Europeanized texts, are obligatory" (ibid.), i.e.:

*hé* 和, connecting nouns (p.359);

*érqiě* 而且, connecting adjectives, but less common than *hé* 和 (p. 360);

*huò* 或, originally only for verbs of equal rank (p. 361);

*yīn* 因, because of', more frequently used in Europeanized texts (p. 361);

*suī* 虽 and *zòng* 纵, in Chinese texts sometimes covert, but need to be enunciated in Europeanized texts (p.361 f.);

*ruò* 若, together with *tǎng* 倘 and *rú* 如 "relational tertiary" (*guānxì mòpǐn* 关系末品), very seldom used in Chinese conditional form, which is usually not marked, but obligatory in Europeanized texts, because the English relator "if" cannot be omitted (p. 362);

*zài* 在, used to form equivalents to English local and temporal prepositions (p.362 f.).

To the second case belong those "connective elements" that were formerly inexistent in Chinese and that borrow Chinese verbs to fill the gap:[143]

*dāng* 当, corresponding to English "when" (p.363);

*guānyú* 关于 and *jiù* 就...*shuō* 说, modifying the scope, inexistent in original Chinese (p.363 f.);

*duìyú* 对于, same as above (p.364).

In *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn*, 468-474, on the other hand, he takes the English conjunctions and prepositions as found in texts that are to be translated into Chinese as starting point. These are:

'and': connecting two or more nouns translated as *hé* 和 or *yǔ* 与, connecting adjectives, adverbs or sentences translated as *érqiě* 而且 or *ér* 而, emphasizing 'both' and 'and' translated as *yòu* 又 ... *yòu* 又. The use of *yǔ* 与 and *érqiě* 而且 is much more frequent than before (p.469 f.);

'or', 'either...or': translated as *huò* 或, but the latter sometimes can also be translated as *ruòbù* 若不 ... *jiùshì* 就是. When 'or' is used as 'otherwise', it is translated as *fǒuzé* 否

---

[143] "中国本来没有这种联结成份，欧化文章里借中国原有的某一些动词来充数[...]" (Xiàndài yǔfǎ 1985: 364).

则, 'neither...nor' is translated as *jìbù* 既不...*yòubù* 又不 (p. 470);

'but' can be translated as *dànshì* 但是 or *rán'ér* 然而; when connecting two opposite

adjectives, only *rán'ér* 然而 or *ér* 而 can be used (p. 470);

'for' and 'because': translated as *yīnwèi* 因为, 'since' translated as *jìrán* 既然;

'therefore': translated as *suǒyǐ* 所以 (p.470);

'though' and 'although': translated as *suī* 虽 (p. 470).

The connectives from *dànshi* 但是 to *suī* 虽 are more frequent in Modern Chinese than

in Old Chinese, but still much more frequent in Europeanized texts.

'Unless': translated as *chúfēi* 除非 (or *chúle* 除了), which is a modern emergence,

ancient times used *gǒubù* 苟不 (p. 471).

The remainder of Wang Li's chapter on connectives deals with local and temporal

prepositions.

In the last chapter of his *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* (Section 47: "New methods of omission, invertion,

insertion and others"), the only chapter which has no counterpart in *Xiàndài yǔfǎ*, Wang

Li also mentions the transposition of temporal (*shíjiān xiūshì* 时间修饰), conditional

(*tiáojiànshì* 条件式) and concessive (*róngxǔshì* 容许式) clauses in Europeanized

grammar:

> According to Chinese grammar, the subordinate part [in complex
>
> sentences] is generally put in front of the main part. [...] But according to
>
> Western grammar, *in principle*, [...] the subordinate part can be put either
>
> in front or after the main clause. [...] If Chinese people imitate this order
>
> of subordinate part following, then that is Europeanized; according to
>
> Chinese original grammar, this should count as inversion.[144]

The Beijing Normal University authors' view on prepositions and conjunctions has been

mainly discussed in chapter 5.2.3.2. They further state the semantic extension of the

conditional conjunction *rúguǒ* 如果 ("if") and the construction *rúguǒ* 如果 ... *nàme* 那

---

[144] "依中国语法，从属部分总是放在主要部分的前面的。[...] 但若依西洋语法，就原则说，在这
种地方，从属部分是前置后置均可得。[...] 如果中国人模仿这种从属部分后置的说法，就是欧
化了；依中国原来的语法而论，就该算为倒装法了。" (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 494, original emphasis)

么 ("if... , then..."). This conjunction was formerly limited to expressing hypothetic conditions, but gained a broader usage due to the influence of the Russian conjunction если ...( то...), which is frequently not used to express hypothesis, but to compare or contrast the first clause to the second clause (Beijing Normal University 1959: 153-155).[145]

Their statement concerning the transposition of temporal (*shíjiān* 时間), conditional (*jiǎshè* 假設) and concessive (*ràngbù* 让步) clauses sounds similar to that of Wang Li, except for one important difference: "[... are] according to the old habit of Chinese generally *more often* put in front of the main clause."[146] They further state that

> [a]fter May Fourth, because of convecting [sic; meaning transferring or permeating? R.C.] foreign languages' relations, the position of this kind of subordinate clause often can also follow the main clause. [... T]his has already become a new habit and is no problem at all.[147]

Li Chi does not treat conjunctions as a whole, but puts forward only a few examples. One of these is *wèile* 为(為)了,

> meaning 'for', [...] usually used as a preposition. *Wei-le* used as a conjunction introducing a clause was not impossible, but infrequent. The increasing tendency to develop long sentences which we see today has caused *wei-le* and a few other words to appear more often as conjunctions joining clauses than as prepositions[.] (Li 1962: 90)

The occurrences of *wèile* 为了 have been discussed in chapter 5.2.3.2. The next one discussed by Li Chi, *yóuyú* 由于 'because of', "[...] may be used both as a preposition and a conjunction joining clauses" (Li 1962: 61). Its frequency counts are included in

---

[145] This usage is similar to the comparative (not conditional) use of English "if" in structures like "if this was the case in former circumstances, then the situation was that in later circumstances".

[146] "[...] 照汉语老習慣总是放在主句前边的**多**。" (Beijing Normal University 1959: 179, emphasis added by R.C.).

[147] "五四以后，因为对流外语的关系，这类从句的位置也经常可以后置了。[...] 已成了新的习惯，不成问题；[...]"(Beijing Normal University 1959: 179).

chapter 5.1.5 of this thesis. *Cóng'ér* 从而 'in consequence of which' "has been used ever since ancient times" and "still retains a distinctive literary flavor" (Li 1962: 63). Li Chi suspected that "[...] its adaptation [in modern Chinese, maybe as recent as 1949] seems to be that it has the function of helping to produce long sentences" (ibid.).

Although Kubler also quotes Wang Li's observation of an increased frequency of *suīrán* 虽然, actuated by a new demand of "a greater degree of explicitness in sentence relations than every [sic] existed before" in Modern Chinese (Kubler 1985: 117), his main concern is the position of concessive and conditional clauses. He again refers to "the rules of traditional Chinese grammar", according to which "concessive clauses containing *suīrán* 'although' are always placed before the main clause of a sentence" (Kubler 1985: 115), with the exception of informal conversation (Chao 1968: 132-3 cited by Kubler ibid.). He continues that

> [u]nder the influence of European languages, Chinese now also regularly
> permits the order with the concessive clause after the main clause. This
> has become quite common in modern written and spoken Chinese.
> (Kubler 1985: 115)

Like concessive clauses with *suīrán* 虽然, also the position of other dependent clauses with *rúguǒ* 如果 ('if') and *jìrán* 既然 ('since') "has changed through Western influence" (Kubler 1985: 117). He adds that "these adverbs [sic] are now used much more frequently than they used to be" (Kubler 1985 117f.).

According to Gunn, the 'Europeanization' of conjunctions consisted in their extension of scope. Formerly used "[...] between two nouns or in longer strings to divide classifications of items listed", the "European use of conjunctions in strings of items not so divided seems to have begun in the late Qing or early Republican eras." (Gunn 1991: 225). Also the set of word classes or parts of speech that could be linked by conjunctions was extended from mainly substantives to attributives and adverbials or even verbs (Gunn 1991: 249f.). Standardization set in from 1955 onwards: "*Gen* 跟 and *tong* 同 were to be reserved for use as prepositional coverbs ('with,' 'than,' 'from'); *he* [和] was to be promoted as the standard conjunction 'and', while *yu* [與] was to be

reduced in use to fixed constructions of *wényán* origin. *Ji* [及] was to be reserved for linking nouns, while *yiji* 以及 ['as well as, along with, and'] would link nouns or verbs and larger sentence segments." (Gunn 1991: 250).

The reason for the "dramatically increased transposition of sentence elements" Gunn sees in the "growing trend toward literal translation following 1918" (Gunn 1991: 239, word order changed). This comprises not only a "great increase in the frequency of transposed causal clauses", but also "conditional, concessive, conditional-concessive, and temporal clauses" (ibid.).

Peyraube mentions transposition of "subordinate clauses (conditional, concessive, temporal, etc.), from an initial position to a post-main clause position" (Peyraube 2000: 9) as one of the "other types of European languages influence [...] often cited as characteristic of obvious influences of European languages on Chinese grammar" (ibid.: 8). These transpositions, he continues, "existed well before any contact between China and the West" (ibid.: 9).

Xie repeats Wang Li's assessment that, due to the influence of Indo-European languages, the use of conjunctive words changed from "casual" to "obligatory" (Xie 2001: 18). He also mentions the inversion of subordinate and main clause, asserting that, whereas normally the modifier clause precedes the main clause,[148] "nowadays the modifier clause in final position has become more frequent".[149]

He Yang dedicates one chapter to the increased frequency of conjunctions (6.1: *Liáncí shǐyòng pínlǜ de zēngjiā* 连词使用频率的增加 "Increase in the application frequency of conjunctions"), containing sections on the increased frequency of coordinative conjunctions both between words and between clauses, on the increased frequency of subordinative conjunctions, supplemented by one chapter on the development of the use of some conjunctions. The clause connecting coordinative conjunctions discussed by

---

[148] Xie used the terms *piānjù* 偏句 ("slanting sentence") and *zhèngjù* 正句 ("straight/central sentence") for modifier clause and main clause. Other authors writing in Chinese like Wang Li used 主从句 for complex sentences.

[149] "[...] 现时则多了偏句后置 [...]" Xie 2001: 18.

him in these two chapters are *qiě* 且 ("and/moreover/yet"), *bìng* 并 ("and/furthermore/also"), *kuàngqiě* 况且 ("moreover/ besides/in addition/furthermore"), *érqiě* 而且 ("... but also/ moreover/ in addition/ furthermore"), *bìngqiě* 并且 ("and/ besides/ moreover/ furthermore/ in addition") (section 6.1.1 (2), pp. 150-153), stating an obvious increase. The reason for this increase he assumes to be translation from and imitation of English (He 2008: 150f.). He also states a clear preponderance of hypotaxis in registers of strong literary flavor (He 2008: 153). In the next chapter on subordinative conjunctions he takes a close look at adversative conjunctions like *suīrán* 虽然 ("although, even though"), *dànshì* 但是 ("but, however"), *rán'ér* 然而 ("but, yet"), etc., conditional conjunctions like *zhǐyào* 只要 ("so long as"), *zhǐyǒu* 只有 ("only"), *bùguǎn* 不管 ("no matter, regardless of"), *wúlùn* 无论 ("no matter, regardless of"), etc., hypothetical conjunctions like *rúguǒ* 如果 ("if"), *jiǎrú* 假如 ("if"), *jíshǐ* 即使 ("even if/though"), *tǎngruò* 倘若 ("if, supposing"), etc. and causal conjunctions like *yīnwèi* 因为 ("because, on account of"), *suǒyǐ* 所以 ("so, as a result"), *yóuyú* 由于 ("due/thanks to, since"), *jìrán* 既然 ("since, as"), etc. (section 6.1.2, pp. 153-156). He generally sees an increase in the frequency of prepositions and conjunctions after May Fourth, the reason for this partly in the influence by English and other Indo-European languages, partly in the need for a closer expression of meaning.

In another chapter he deals with the transposition of compound sentences (9.2: *Zhǔcóng fùjù de yǔxù biànhuà* 主从复句的语序变化 "Changes in the word order of subordinative compound sentences"). Although he presents the traditionally acknowledged order first, with the subordinate clause preceding the main clause, he also objected that the situation of old *báihuà* before May Fourth was not that simple, arguing in two ways: on the one hand, he produces several examples of subordinate clauses (or, more precisely, the clause giving the reason) following the main clause, starting from Classical Chinese (He 2008: 267); on the other hand he also cites authors challenging the commonly accepted assumption that the clause giving the reason be the subordinate clause and the clause stating the result be the main clause - instead regarding the causal clause as main clause (ibid.: 269). He shows that the same applies for conditional

clauses. Adversative and hypothetical clauses do, according to He (2008: 270f.), indeed strictly follow the order "subordinative clause first, main clause second". He also names the conditions under which the subordinate clause can follow the main clause, e.g. markedness (ibid.: 271). In the second part of this chapter He then describes the changes in the word order after May Fourth, e.g. the possibility of adversative or hypothetical clauses following their main clause instead of preceding it (ibid.: 273). According to his survey, the position of adversative and hypothetical clauses following the main clause was already comparatively widespread in written language in the 1920ies and 1930ies (ibid.). He also states it to be quite common in contemporary Chinese (ibid.: 275), backing this statement by investigating sentences containing the adversative conjunctions *suīrán* 虽然 and *jǐnguǎn* 尽管 (both "though") or the hypothetical conjunctions *rúguǒ* 如果 and *jíshǐ* 即使 ("if" and "even if"). His results show that subordinate clauses with *suīrán* 虽然 and *jǐnguǎn* 尽管 follow the main clause in approximately 23% of all cases, whereas subordinate clauses with *rúguǒ* 如果 and *jíshǐ* 即使 in more than 93% of all cases precede the main clause.

## Clause connecting conjunctions and transposition of subordinate clauses in the corpus samples

**Table 5-26: Clause connecting conjunctions**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | average | | average | | average | | average | | average |
| copulative conjunc- tions * | Period I | 53 | 17.7 | 239 | 47.8 | -- | -- | 239 | 53.1 | 531 | 42.5 |
| | Period II | 156 | 31.2 | 267 | 53.4 | 123 | 30.8 | 153 | 34.0 | 699 | 37.8 |
| | Period III | 86 | 17.2 | 125 | 25.0 | 74 | 14.8 | 105 | 21.0 | 390 | 19.5 |
| | Period IV | 37 | 9.3 | 59 | 14.8 | 49 | 16.3 | 77 | 15.4 | 222 | 13.9 |
| | Period V | 75 | 18.8 | 73 | 14.6 | 111 | 22.2 | 48 | 9.6 | 307 | 16.2 |
| | **in all** | **407** | **19.4** | **763** | **31.8** | **357** | **21.0** | **622** | **25.9** | **2149** | **25.0** |
| adversative and disjunctive conjunc- tions** | Period I | 35 | 11.7 | 92 | 18.4 | -- | -- | 60 | 13.3 | 187 | 15.0 |
| | Period II | 93 | 18.6 | 74 | 14.8 | 108 | 27.0 | 39 | 8.7 | 314 | 17.0 |
| | Period III | 87 | 17.4 | 107 | 21.4 | 93 | 18.6 | 18 | 3.6 | 305 | 15.3 |
| | Period IV | 52 | 13.0 | 83 | 20.8 | 46 | 15.3 | 31 | 6.2 | 212 | 13.3 |
| | Period V | 50 | 25.0 | 89 | 17.8 | 85 | 17.0 | 25 | 5.0 | 249 | 13.1 |
| | **in all** | **317** | **15.1** | **445** | **18.5** | **332** | **19.5** | **173** | **7.2** | **1267** | **14.7** |
| causal and consecutive conjunc- tions*** | Period I | 44 | 14.7 | 34 | 6.8 | -- | -- | 21 | 4.7 | 99 | 7.9 |
| | Period II | 29 | 5.8 | 33 | 6.6 | 39 | 9.8 | 20 | 4.4 | 121 | 6.5 |
| | Period III | 17 | 3.4 | 36 | 7.2 | 48 | 9.6 | 9 | 1.8 | 110 | 5.5 |
| | Period IV | 5 | 1.3 | 11 | 2.8 | 6 | 2.0 | 7 | 1.4 | 29 | 1.8 |
| | Period V | 12 | 3.0 | 27 | 5.4 | 23 | 4.6 | 11 | 2.2 | 73 | 3.8 |
| | **in all** | **107** | **5.1** | **141** | **5.9** | **116** | **6.8** | **68** | **2.8** | **432** | **5.0** |
| conditional and con- cessive conjunc- tions**** | Period I | 39 | 13.0 | 145 | 29.0 | -- | -- | 85 | 18.9 | 269 | 21.5 |
| | Period II | 99 | 19.8 | 97 | 19.4 | 74 | 18.5 | 48 | 10.7 | 318 | 17.2 |
| | Period III | 15 | 3.0 | 58 | 11.6 | 47 | 9.4 | 31 | 1.6 | 151 | 7.6 |
| | Period IV | 26 | 6.5 | 33 | 8.3 | 17 | 5.7 | 26 | 1.3 | 102 | 6.4 |
| | Period V | 22 | 5.5 | 28 | 5.6 | 48 | 9.6 | 13 | 0.7 | 111 | 5.8 |
| | **in all** | **201** | **9.6** | **361** | **15.0** | **186** | **10.9** | **203** | **8.5** | **750** | **8.7** |

*bìng 并, bìngqiě 并且, ér 而, érqiě 而且, kuàngqiě 况且, qiě 且, yǐjí 以及

** bùguǎn 不管, dànshì 但是, kěshì 可是, rán'ér 然而, suī 虽, suīrán 虽然, wúlùn 无论, zhǐyǒu 只有, zòng 纵, fǒuzé 否则, huò 或, huòzhě 或者

*** cóng'ér 从而, suǒyǐ 所以, yīncǐ 因此, jì 既, jìrán 既然

**** jíshǐ 即使, jiǎrú 假如, rú 如, rúguǒ 如果, ruò 若, tǎng 倘, zhǐyào 只要

According to table 5-24, and in contrast to most of the statements of the different authors collected above, there was not an increase, but a decrease of most clause connecting conjunctions through the five periods. Other than Wang Li stated in *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* on page 469 f., *érqiě* 而且 was not much more frequent than before, but had its peak in period II. He Yang stated an obvious increase in conjunctions due to translation from or imitation of English. If this was the case, these conjunctions should be most frequent in translations, but they are not: the frequency count for "narrative prose translated" shows its third place after "essays" and "narrative prose Chinese" in period V. There was, anyhow, the all-time high of copulative conjunctions in the register "narrative prose translated" in period II, closely followed by "newspaper" in period I - only their frequency decreased in both registers. The copulative conjunctions *bìng* 并, *bìngqiě* 并且, *ér* 而, *érqiě* 而且, *kuàngqiě* 况且, *qiě* 且, *yǐjí* 以及 peaked in period II in the registers "narrative prose Chinese", "narrative prose translated", and "essays", and in period I in "newspaper". The occurences of these conjunctions only reached 60% (narrative prose Chinese), 27% (narrative prose translated), and 72% (essays) of period II in period V, or in the case of "newspaper" 18% of period I in period V.

The adversative and disjunctive conjunctions *bùguǎn* 不管, *dànshì* 但是, *kěshì* 可是, *rán'ér* 然而, *suī* 虽, *suīrán* 虽然, *wúlùn* 无论, *zhǐyǒu* 只有, *zòng* 纵, *fǒuzé* 否则, *huò* 或, *huòzhě* 或者 did increase from period I (100%) to period V (214%), though not steadily, in "narrative prose Chinese". However, they reached their highest frequency in "essays" in period II, not in "narrative prose translated" nor in period V. Contradicting the findings of He Yang, as well as the assertions of the other authors, nearly all clause connecting conjunctions had their peaks in periods I and II, and moreover, in the case of "newspaper", "narrative prose translated" and "essays", even in Literary Chinese instead of Colloquial.

**Table 5-27: Transposition of subordinate clauses with *rúguǒ* 如果 ("if"), *suīrán* 虽然 ("(al)though"), *jìrán* 既然 ("since", "as")**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | average | | average | | average | | average | | average |
| total number of subordinate clauses, … | Period I | 12 | 4.0 | 4 | 0.8 | -- | -- | 5 | 1.1 | 21 | 1.7 |
| | Period II | 4 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 4.0 | 2 | 0.4 | 22 | 1.2 |
| | Period III | 12 | 2.4 | 20 | 4.0 | 15 | 3.0 | 4 | 0.8 | 51 | 2.6 |
| | Period IV | 13 | 3.3 | 13 | 3.3 | 4 | 1.3 | 10 | 2.0 | 40 | 2.5 |
| | Period V | 17 | 4.3 | 17 | 3.4 | 11 | 2.2 | 6 | 1.2 | 51 | 2.7 |
| | **in all** | **58** | **2.8** | **54** | **2.3** | **46** | **2.7** | **27** | **1.1** | **185** | **2.2** |
| … thereof subordinate clause preceding main clause | Period I | 12 | 4.0 | 4 | 0.8 | -- | -- | 5 | 1.1 | 21 | 1.7 |
| | Period II | 4 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3.5 | 2 | 0.4 | 20 | 1.1 |
| | Period III | 11 | 2.2 | 20 | 4.0 | 13 | 2.6 | 4 | 0.8 | 48 | 2.4 |
| | Period IV | 13 | 3.3 | 11 | 2.8 | 1 | 0.3 | 10 | 2.0 | 35 | 2.2 |
| | Period V | 17 | 4.3 | 13 | 2.6 | 8 | 1.6 | 6 | 1.2 | 44 | 2.3 |
| | **in all** | **57** | **2.7** | **48** | **2.0** | **36** | **2.1** | **27** | **1.1** | **168** | **2.0** |
| subordinate clause following main clause | Period I | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Period II | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.1 |
| | Period III | 1 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.2 |
| | Period IV | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.5 | 3 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0.3 |
| | Period V | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0.8 | 3 | 0.6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0.4 |
| | **in all** | **1** | **0.1** | **6** | **0.3** | **10** | **0.6** | **0** | **0** | **17** | **0.2** |
| percentage preceding / following | Period I | 100% / 0% | | 100% / 0% | | -- | | 100% / 0% | | 100% / 0% | |
| | Period II | 100% / 0% | | -- / -- | | 88% / 12% | | 100% / 0% | | 91% / 9% | |
| | Period III | 92% / 8% | | 100% / 0% | | 87% / 13% | | 100% / 0% | | 94% / 6% | |
| | Period IV | 100% / 0% | | 85% / 15% | | 25% / 75% | | 100% / 0% | | 88% / 12% | |
| | Period V | 100% / 0% | | 76% / 24% | | 73% / 27% | | 100% / 0% | | 86% / 14% | |
| | **in all** | **98% / 2%** | | **89% / 11%** | | **78% / 22%** | | **100% / 0%** | | **91% / 9%** | |

In contrast to Kubler's opinion that the concessive clause following the main clause had "become quite common in modern written and spoken Chinese" (Kubler 1985: 115), table 5-25 shows that this transposition, though permitted, is nowhere near "common". It appears in the two registers "narrative prose translated" and "essays", in periods IV and V (with one outlier in "narrative prose Chinese"). At least, in "essays" of period IV, the subordinate clause is following the main clause in 75% of all sentences, followed by

approximately 25% in period V, in both "narrative prose translated" and "essays". The order of subordinate clause and main clause is most frequently inverted in "essays", followed by "narrative prose translated" (11% of subordinate clauses following the main clause). It is hardly ever inverted in "narrative prose Chinese" (2%) and never in "newspaper".

### *5.2.4.2  Pronouns as heads*

Regarding the phenomenon of modifers in front of personal pronouns, opinions on its origin differ widely. Wang Li, who was of the opinion that "according to Chinese linguistic usage, in front of a personal pronoun there cannot be a modifyer",[150] attributes it, rather reluctantly, to Japanese influence, but holds that it could as well be called 'Europeanization'.[151]

The authors of Beijing Normal University, on the other hand, state more carefully that "by the old habits of Chinese" personal pronouns were "normally not often modifyed by attributes".[152] They, too, attribute the new acceptance after May Fourth to the influence of Japanese, noting as well that of all three persons, 3rd person pronouns were most commonly modified and 2nd person pronouns least commonly (1959: 147).

Kubler goes even further than Wang Li in stating that adjectival clauses with pronominal heads were unknown before May Fourth. He assumes that they "probably originated in attempts to translate Western language relative clauses" (Kubler 1985: 125), but considers influence from Japanese also possible. He further asserts that "[p]ronouns modified by adjectival clauses now occur fairly frequently in modern written Chinese" (ibd.).

---

[150] "依中国语的习惯，人称代词的前面是不能有修饰品的；[...]" (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 370), similarly in *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 485: "中国的代词，除了"者"外，前面都不能有鬏饰品。".

[151] "这种新语法**恐怕只**是日化，不是欧化。但若说是欧化，也可以说得通。" (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 485, accentuation by R.C. The two sentences translate as: "This type of new grammar is probably [literally: afraid of sth being so] only Japanization, not Europeanization. But if one would say it is Europeanization, that is understandable, too.").

[152] "汉语老习惯，[...]，一般是不大被定语修饰的。" (Beijing Normal University 1959: 146).

Gunn notes in his section on "Euro-Japanese Features in Grammar and Rhetoric Prior to 1918" that pronouns had already previous to 1900 functioned as head of phrases preposed as attributives (Gunn 1991: 224), but that by the early years of the PRC [sic, did he mean the early Republic? R.C.] pronominal heads with preposed clauses appeared, becoming common after 1918 (ibd.). In the following section on "Euro-Japanese Features in Grammar and Rhetoric Since 1918" he explicates that

> [...] the inclusion of verb phrases in the attributive position occurred
> shortly before 1918. After 1918 these constructions were expanded to
> include verb-object constructions and other extended clause elements in
> the attributive position. (Gunn 1991: 231)

Peyraube, too, times the appearance of pronominal heads in adjectival phrases to the beginning of the 20th century, assessing this phenomenon as one of the few "for which an explanation of Western influences would be tempting" (Peyraube 2000: 10), even though "[i]n this case, an influence from Japanese is probably more likely, as this phenomenon is native to Japanese syntax" (Peyraube 2000: 19).

He Yang, finally, observes that pronouns as heads, originally existent in Chinese though unusual, developed around May Fourth but even in 2008 were not used frequently (He 2008: 84-88). Like the authors of Beijing Normal University, he notes that the 1st and the 3rd person pronouns are more frequently modifyed than the 2nd person pronoun (He 2008: 86). More than as a phenomenon of grammar he classifies it as one of style.

In the entire corpus occur only 12 tokens of modifier + pronoun. The search was conducted for structural particle + personal pronoun. The findings are:

Period II

...孤立在甲板上沐着海风看日出的**我**，... (narrative prose Chinese 1926)

... 越州掌故完全不懂的**我**，... (essays 1926)

Period III

... 坐在石岸上的**我**... (narrative prose Chinese 1930)

...聪明的**你**... (narrative prose Chinese 1930)

... 那个时期的**她**，... (narrative prose Chinese 1942)

一个少佐的**我**，... (narrative prose translated 1942, Russian original)

Period IV:

... 他思想中所看到的**她**，... (narrative prose translated 1950, French original)

Period V:

... 俺的**他**... (narrative prose Chinese 1983)

... 更悲哀的**她**... (narrative prose translated 1993, English original)

... 野心勃勃的**他**... (narrative prose translated 1999, English original)

... 现今的**她**... (narrative prose translated 1999, English original)

... 当时的**我**... (essays 1999)

The two most complex modifying clauses appear in 1926, while modifying adjectival phrases appear in 1930 and 1993, nominal phrases in 1942 and 1999. 5 tokens appear in "narrative prose Chinese", another 5 tokens in "narrative prose translated", the remainder of two tokens in "essays". In accordance with the authors of Beijing Normal University and with He Yang, a 3rd person pronoun appears 6 times as head, the 1st person pronoun 5 times and the 2nd person pronoun once.

### 5.2.4.3   *Cataphoric use of personal pronouns*

According to Wang Li, the cataphoric use of personal pronouns does occasionally appear in Western languages and therefore also in translations from Western languages, but was still rarely seen in Chinese (*Yŭfă lĭlùn* 1984: 484 f., *Xiàndài yŭfă* 1985: 369). Nevertheless, this cataphoric use of personal pronouns is not investigated in this thesis.

### 5.2.4.4   *Position of speaker in direct quotations*

The same technical reasons are responsible for not analyzing the position of the speaker in direct quotations mentioned by Kubler and by Gunn. Kubler dedicates a whole chapter to this subject ("Position of the Speaker in Direct Quotations", 1985: 106-114), stating that even though traditionally the speaker could only be put in front of the direct quotation, now also insertion, postposition and omission were possible. Gunn points out

that "unmediated speech occurred in Buddhist texts and some medieval *pinghua* fictional narratives" (Gunn 1991: 241), but that "clauses mediating either speech or thought prior to the twentieth century were placed initially in the sentence." (ibid.). "Embedding and postposing of these clauses" appeared, according to him, after 1918.

### 5.2.4.5  Superlative constructions with *zhī yī* 之一

Another topic in Wang Li's section 46 on "New methods in the usage of pronouns/substitutions and new methods of using numbers" is the use of *zhī yī* 之一 both with and without the superlative with *zuì* 最. He calls it a "Europeanized formulation" which in Western languages often goes with the superlative (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 489) and offers two examples from French (in *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 490) and two examples from Chinese (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 373).

Gunn points out that

> [t]he accomodation of foreign-language expressions after 1918 resulted in innovative expressions in Chinese that involved new arrangements of embedded elements and frequently a slight shift semantically of the words involved in order to act as analogues to the foreign expressions: *zui...zhi yi* "one of the most"; [...] (Gunn 1991: 227)

He estimates that

> [a]part from designating fractions (*san fen zhi yi* "one-third"), the appearance of *zhi yi* itself as a head without a measure word (*zhi yizhong*) may be as late as the 1900's [...]. The addition of *zui* in the embedded attributive, creating another layer of embedding, appears to have begun in the years following 1918. (Gunn 1991: 227f.)

Xie Yaoji simply counts the use of *zhī yī* 之一 among the benefits of 'Europeanization' (Xie 2001: 19).

He Yang dedicates this expression an entire chapter: "4.2.3 *'zhī yī' yòngfǎ de fāzhǎn*" ("'之一'用法的发展": Development of the use of *zhī yī*), pointing out that it was

originally used to express fraction numbers, mostly for aggregates of fixed quantity, but sometimes also following aggregates of unfixed quantity (He 2008: 102). He explains that around May Fourth, in the process of translation, people used this apparently similar *zhī yī* 之一 to translate the English "one of…"-structure, which is frequently used with aggregates of unfixed quantity (ibid.: 103). He continues that the construction *zuì* 最 … *zhī yī* 之一 was formed since May Fourth to translate the English "one of the most…" or similar (ibid.: 107), but although it was developing until today, it could still not be found in the spoken language (ibid.: 110). He Yang lists a number of written language examples with *zuì* 最 … *zhī yī* 之一 but does not give any frequency counts like in the case of *zhī yī* 之一 without *zuì* 最 or other examples.

The following table shows the occurrences of *zhī yī* 之一 in the corpus texts, excluding fraction numbers by excluding *fēn zhī yī* 分之一 structures.

**Table 5-28: Frequency of sentences with *zhī yī* 之一 in the corpus texts**

|  |  | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | average |  | average |  | average |  | average |  | average |
| *zhī yī* 之一 | Period I | 3 | *1.0* | 2 | *0.4* | -- | -- | 9 | *2.0* | 14 | *1.1* |
|  | Period II | 0 | *0* | 4 | *0.8* | 2 | *0.5* | 2 | *0.4* | 8 | *0.4* |
|  | Period III | 1 | *0.2* | 2 | *0.4* | 2 | *0.4* | 6 | *1.2* | 11 | *0.6* |
|  | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.3* | 0 | *0* | 4 | *0.8* | 5 | *0.3* |
|  | Period V | 2 | *0.5* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 3 | *0.2* |
|  | **in all** | **6** | *0.3* | **9** | **0.4** | **5** | **0.3** | **21** | *0.9* | **41** | **0.5** |

A closer look at the text passages where *zhī yī* 之一 appears shows that of these 41 instances only 14 pass as Chinese counterpart of English "one of". In some of the early texts *zhī* 之 and *yī* 一 belong to different sentences, in other cases *zhī yi* 之一 is followed by other parts of speach. The revised counts are shown in the table below.

**Table 5-29: Frequency of sentences with *zhī yī* 之一 as "one of" in the corpus texts**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | average | | average | | average | | average | | average |
| *zhī yī* 之一 "one of …" | Period I | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | -- | -- | 1 | *0.2* | 2 | *0.2* |
| | Period II | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.1* |
| | Period III | 1 | *0.2* | 2 | *0.4* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 3 | *0.2* |
| | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.3* | 0 | *0* | 4 | *0.8* | 5 | *0.3* |
| | Period V | 2 | *0.5* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 3 | *0.2* |
| | **in all** | **3** | ***0.1*** | **5** | ***0.2*** | **1** | ***0.1*** | **5** | ***0.2*** | **14** | ***0.2*** |

Of *zuì ... zhī yī* 最 ... 之一 there is only one token in the entire corpus in period V in "narrative prose Chinese" (1999).

# 5.3 Lexicon and semantics

## 5.3.1 Semantic extension of passive marker *bèi* 被

The discussion of the passive marker *bèi* 被 is divided into two separate aspects, one of which has been discussed in chapter 5.2.2.2 "Increase of passive marker *bèi* 被" already. Also the close relation of both aspects has been mentioned before, because any semantic extension of *bèi* 被 passive sentences would result in its more frequent use. Wheras the former chapter focussed on the numbers in which *bèi* 被 passive sentences increased and on the percentage in which agents were expressed or not expressed, this chapter will discuss different authors' theses on the semantic extension of *bèi* 被 passive sentences.

Wang Li writes in the 1940ies that the passive marker *bèi* 被 was formerly only used for unsatisfactory or undesirable events, but was then used for all kinds of events, especially in translations (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 353), because of the influence of "Western" (*xīwén* 西文) on Chinese grammar (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 462): "the scope of

passive voice expanded, and in modern Europeanized texts events that are not unsatisfactory can also use the passive voice".[153]

Li Chi dedicates one chapter to "*pei* 被" [Pinyin *bèi*] as "one of the signs of passive voice" (Li 1962: 52), citing Wang Lis estimation that "the passive voice is used in Chinese only to show unfortunate happenings such as *pei ta* 被打 (been beaten), *pei sha* 被殺 (been killed) or *pei p'ien* 被騙 (been deceived),"[154] and holding that "[a]lthough some other writers have cited sentences from ancient works to prove that the passive voice does not necessarily imply calamity, what Wang says is generally true" (Li 1962: 52). Later on, she continues with the observation that "[t]he process of liberating *pei* from its traditional connection with calamity continues in present day usage" (ibid.).

Also Kubler dedicates one chapter to "The Passive with *bèi*" (1985: 88-98), starting with "[a] classic example of Europeanized syntax in Modern Chinese is the increase in frequency and range of use of the passive construction with *bèi*" (ibid.: 88). After quoting different authors supporting the estimation of its limitation to "verbs of infelicitous meaning" (ibid.: 89), he continues that "[i]n the last few decades, the use of *bèi* has changed considerably. It is now used much more widely than it was before and occurs freely and frequently without regard to [...] infelicitous meaning [...]" (ibid.: 91). As one reason for this circumstance, he assumes this to be "the result of word for word translation from English and other Western languages, where passives are not limited to infelicitous verbs with agents [...]" (ibid.: 92). As another reason he gives Chao's suggestion "that the new uses of this marker entered Chinese through lazy translators who identified English *by*, which introduces the agent in English passive constructions, with Chinese *bèi*" (ibid., citing Chao 1968: 703).

Edward Gunn observes in his chapter on "*Bei* Passive Constructions" (p. 219f.) that "[a]rguments that the use of *bei* in passive constructions traditionally was limited by

---

[153] "[...]，被动式的范围毕竟扩充了不少，在现代的欧化文章里，非不如意的事也可以用被动式了。" *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 462.

[154] Li Chi 1962: 52 citing Wang Li *Chung-kuo yü-fa li-lun*, II, 291-297, without giving the publication year.

semantic constraints to afflictive meanings or situations in which a desired or intended action was blocked have had to admit to exceptions" (Gunn 1991: 219). He also holds that it was already during the first decade of the twentieth century that "these exceptions had become so numerous that the late Qing must be regarded as the decisive period in which *bei* was relieved of any constraints that may previously have governed its use" (ibid.). Concerning the presumed connection with 'Europeanization' of the language, he points out that "the use of *bei* appears in original Chinese texts as well as in translated or Europeanized text" (ibid.). He closes his chapter on *bei* with the remark that "[t]he historical record suggests that *bei* always had the capacity to be employed without constraints and that the advent of Euro-Japanese influence in the late Qing increased greatly the frequency of its unconstrained usage" (ibid.: 220).

Xie simply mentiones the widespread use of the passive marker *bèi* 被, which is not limited to undesirable affairs any more (Xie 2001: 18).

After repeating that from Han dynasty up to May Fourth the use of "*bèi*"-sentences was limited to undesired events (He 2008: 226), He Yang proceeds by discussing the question "desirable for whom" - for the subject/patiens of the sentence or for the speaker (pp. 227-229). He gives detailed statistics on negative/neutral/positive meanings of *bèi*-sentences in different stages of old *báihuà* and for different passive markers (like *bèi* 被, *jiào* 叫 and *gěi* 给) (pp. 231-232), followed by statistics on Modern Chinese usage of *bèi*-sentences (p. 234). His results are:

Modern Literature 1923-1936 (end of period II – beginning of period III):
negative 61.7%, neutral 30.1%, positive 8.1% (together 209 occurrences of *bèi*),
contemporary literature 1956-1995 (approx. periods IV and V):
negative 60.2%, neutral 30.1%, positive 9.7% (together 362 occurrences of *bèi*),
contemporary academic prose (1994-1996):
negative 43.0%, neutral 50.4%, positive 6.7% (together 391 occurrences of *bèi*) (He 2008: 234)

For comparison, here are his results for "narrative prose Chinese", old *báihuà*, end of Ming until end of Qing dynasties (16th century to 1902):

negative 92.7%, neutral 5.6%, positive 1.7% (together 1456 occurrences of *bèi*) (ibid.: 231).

He quotes different opinions on the reason why *bèi*-passives are no longer limited to undesirable events: Although most scholars seem to attribute this to influence of foreign languages, especially English (He 2008: 235f.), another possible reason would be the increasing grammaticalization of the passive marker *bèi* 被.[155] According to He's tables, *bèi* 被, the passive marker used in written language susceptible to influences by European languages via translations, is the only passive marker that nowadays also allows neutral or positive meanings on a large scale (cf. also He 2008: 239).). Again, He holds that internal linguistic change takes time, whereas the evolution from negative passive marker *bèi* (stable from Han dynasty to May Fourth) to neutral passive marker *bèi* (since May Fourth) in written language nearly took no time at all, therefore this might be another example for internal linguistic change triggered by contact to European languages, especially English (cf. He 2008: 237).

---

[155] E.g. Xiang Xi 1993: 下 501, cited by He 2008: 236, who also gave an evolution chain from the verb *bèi* 被 to the passive marker, which also accounts for the former negative meaning in *bèi*-sentences. He Yang himself confirmed that the negative meaning in *bèi*-passives cannot be attributed to the meaning of the verb *bèi* 被, but is due to the syntax of marked passive sentences, because other passive markers like *jiào* 叫 and *gěi* 给, used nearly exclusively in spoken language, show the same bias towards negative meanings (He 2008: 236).

**Bèi in the corpus texts**

## Table 5-30: Frequency of *bèi* 被 passive sentences with negative, neutral, and positive meaning in the corpus

| *bèi* 被 in sentences with … | | narrative prose Chinese | average | narrative prose translated | average | essays | average | newspaper | average | total | average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| … negative meaning | Period I | 5 | *1.7* | 9 | *1.8* | -- | -- | 20 | *4.4* | 34 | *2.7* |
| | Period II | 10 | *2.0* | 1 | *0.2* | 1 | *0.3* | 13 | *2.9* | 25 | *1.4* |
| | Period III | 23 | *4.6* | 9 | *1.8* | 12 | *2.4* | 49 | *9.8* | 93 | *4.7* |
| | Period IV | 9 | *2.3* | 7 | *1.8* | 10 | *3.3* | 11 | *2.2* | 37 | *2.3* |
| | Period V | 8 | *2.0* | 9 | *1.8* | 16 | *3.2* | 7 | *1.4* | 40 | *2.1* |
| | **in all** | **55** | ***2.6*** | **35** | ***1.5*** | **39** | ***2.3*** | **100** | ***4.2*** | **229** | ***2.7*** |
| … neutral meaning | Period I | 5 | *1.7* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 1 | *0.2* | 6 | *0.5* |
| | Period II | 4 | *0.8* | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.2* | 6 | *0.3* |
| | Period III | 8 | *1.6* | 2 | *0.4* | 4 | *0.8* | 0 | *0* | 14 | *0.7* |
| | Period IV | 9 | *2.3* | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.3* | 1 | *0.2* | 11 | *0.7* |
| | Period V | 8 | *2.0* | 9 | *1.8* | 7 | *1.4* | 4 | *0.8* | 28 | *1.5* |
| | **in all** | **34** | ***1.6*** | **12** | ***0.5*** | **12** | ***0.7*** | **7** | ***0.3*** | **65** | ***0.8*** |
| … positive meaning | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period II | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period III | 1 | *0.2* | 1 | *0.2* | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 3 | *0.2* |
| | Period IV | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
| | Period V | 0 | *0* | 5 | *1.0* | 5 | *1.0* | 0 | *0* | 10 | *0.5* |
| | **in all** | **1** | ***0.1*** | **6** | ***0.3*** | **6** | ***0.4*** | **0** | ***0*** | **13** | ***0.2*** |
| together (see also chapter 5.2.2.2) | Period I | 10 | *3.3* | 9 | *1.8* | -- | -- | 21 | *4.6* | 40 | *3.2* |
| | Period II | 14 | *2.8* | 2 | *0.4* | 1 | *0.3* | 14 | *3.1* | 31 | *1.7* |
| | Period III | 32 | *6.4* | 12 | *2.4* | 17 | *3.4* | 49 | *9.8* | 110 | *5.5* |
| | Period IV | 18 | *4.5* | 7 | *1.8* | 11 | *3.7* | 12 | *2.4* | 48 | *3.0* |
| | Period V | 16 | *4.0* | 23 | *4.6* | 28 | *5.6* | 11 | *2.2* | 78 | *4.1* |
| | **in all** | **90** | ***4.3*** | **53** | ***2.2*** | **57** | ***3.4*** | **107** | ***4.6*** | **307** | ***3.6*** |

The table shows that there is a small, uneven increase of *bèi*-sentences with neutral or positive meaning. No *bèi*-sentences with positive meaning and only a few with neutral meaning (7 of 111) can be found in "newspaper", which is the register with most *bèi*-sentences. Only one *bèi*-sentence with positive meaning appears in "narrative prose Chinese", but here the largest number of *bèi*-sentences with neutral meaning can be

found. The two registers with most positive *bèi*-sentences are "narrative prose translated" and "essays" - both with one occurrence each in period III and five occurrences each in period V.

The percentages of *bèi*-sentences with negative/neutral/positive meaning in all registers of my corpus are:

period I: 85% / 15% / 0% (together 43 occurrences of *bèi* 被);

period II: 81% / 19% / 0% (32 occurrences);

period III: 85% / 13% / 3% (111 occurrences);

period IV: 77% / 23% / 0% (48 occurences);

period V: 51% / 36% / 13% (78 occurrences)

In comparison with He Yangs results, the above table shows more sentences with negative and less sentences with neutral meaning, but it shows also the development towards *bèi* 被 as a neutral, grammaticalized marker for passive sentences.

## 5.3.2  Extension of potential mood

Wang Li observes that also *kě* 可 underwent semantic extension: Whereas the original meaning of *kě* 可 was to express that something is allowed or permitted (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 352), or is 'feasible' or 'practicable', and *kě* 可 was to be used only in declarative sentences (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1985: 458), the Europeanized meaning of *kě* 可 and its composites like *kěyǐ* 可以, *kěnéng* 可能 and *kěnéngde* 可能地, also includes possibility ('maybe like this' or 'not necessarily not like this'),[156] translating the broader meaning of English 'may' and emerging also in descriptive and equative sentences (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1985: 352). He also mentions *jǐnkěnéng* 尽可能 ('as ... as possible') as new construction in *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* (1985: 353). Concerning the construction *yǒu ... de kěnéng* 有...的可能 ('there is the possibility of ...'), he writes that it was probably influenced by Japanese.[157]

---

[156] "[...]乃是"或者如此"或"未必不如此"的意思[...]" (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 352).

[157] Actually, here again he used the expression 'be afraid of': "例倒恐怕是受了日语的影响。" (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 460).

Similar to *yǒu ... de kěnéng* 有...的可能 is *yǒu ... de bìyào* 有...的必要 ('there is the need of ...') mentioned by Edward Gunn, containing *bìyào* as a noun (as a loan from Japanese *hitsuyō* "necessity") and resulting "in new syntactic configurations analogous to those found in Japanese" (Gunn 1991: 230).

As a result of this semantic extension one should expect an increase in the use of *kě* 可 and its composites.

**Table 5-31: *Kě* 可, *kěyǐ* 可以, *kěnéng* 可能**

|  |  | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | average |  | average |  | average |  | average |  | average |
| all *kě* 可* | Period I | 57 | *19.0* | 97 | *19.4* | -- | -- | 70 | *15.6* | 224 | *17.9* |
|  | Period II | 112 | *22.4* | 96 | *19.2* | 105 | *26.3* | 45 | *10.0* | 358 | *19.4* |
|  | Period III | 70 | *14.0* | 88 | *17.6* | 63 | *12.6* | 34 | *6.8* | 255 | *12.8* |
|  | Period IV | 54 | *13.5* | 80 | *20.0* | 32 | *10.7* | 36 | *7.2* | 202 | *12.6* |
|  | Period V | 46 | *11.5* | 98 | *19.6* | 59 | *11.8* | 34 | *6.8* | 237 | *12.5* |
|  | **in all** | **339** | ***16.1*** | **459** | ***19.1*** | **259** | ***15.2*** | **219** | ***9.1*** | **1276** | ***14.8*** |
| *kěyǐ* 可以 | Period I | 17 | *5.7* | 10 | *2.0* | -- | -- | 6 | *1.3* | 33 | *2.6* |
|  | Period II | 14 | *2.8* | 13 | *2.6* | 36 | *9.0* | 2 | *0.4* | 65 | *3.5* |
|  | Period III | 21 | *4.2* | 19 | *3.8* | 29 | *5.8* | 5 | *1.0* | 74 | *3.7* |
|  | Period IV | 8 | *2.0* | 15 | *3.8* | 10 | *3.3* | 12 | *2.4* | 45 | *2.8* |
|  | Period V | 7 | *1.8* | 16 | *3.2* | 10 | *2.0* | 7 | *1.4* | 40 | *2.1* |
|  | **in all** | **67** | ***3.2*** | **73** | ***3.0*** | **85** | ***5.0*** | **32** | ***1.3*** | **257** | ***3.0*** |
| *kěnéng* 可能 | Period I | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* |
|  | Period II | 1 | *0.2* | 0 | *0* | 7 | *1.8* | 1 | *0.2* | 9 | *0.5* |
|  | Period III | 3 | *0.6* | 3 | *0.6* | 0 | *0* | 5 | *1.0* | 11 | *0.6* |
|  | Period IV | 6 | *1.5* | 12 | *3.0* | 1 | *0.3* | 5 | *1.0* | 24 | *1.5* |
|  | Period V | 7 | *1.8* | 6 | *1.5* | 7 | *1.4* | 9 | *1.8* | 29 | *1.5* |
|  | **in all** | **17** | ***0.8*** | **21** | ***0.9*** | **15** | ***0.8*** | **20** | ***0.8*** | **73** | ***0.9*** |

* including *kěyǐ* 可以, *kěnéng* 可能, 175 instances of *kěshì* 可是, which do not all translate as 'but', and other composites with *kě* 可.

Concerning the composites with *kě* 可 that Wang Li mentioned, they occur too seldom to put them in a table. Their appearances are listed below:

*...de kěnéng* ...的可能 (noun: 'possibility, probability') without *yǒu* 有:

total 3 tokens: 2 in 1 sample of "essays" in period II, 1 in "essays" period V

*yǒu...de kěnèng* 有...的可能 ('to have' + noun 'possibility, probability'):

total 3 tokens: 1 in "essays" of period II, 1 in "narrative prose Chinese" in period III, 1 in "essays" of period V

*yǒu...de bìyào* 有...的必要 ('to have' + noun 'obligation, necessity':

total 3 tokens: 1 in "narrative prose Chinese", 2 in two samples of "essays" of period II

*yǒu kěnéng* 有可能 ('possibly'):

total 6 tokens: 1 in "newspaper" of period III, 1 in "newspaper" of period IV, 1 in each register in period V

*kěnéngde* 可能的 ('possible, probable', no findings of 可能地 or 底):

total 5 tokens: 1 in "essays" of period II, 1 in "narrative prose Chinese", 1 in "newspaper" of period III, 2 in one sample of "narrative prose translated" in period IV

*jìnkěnéng* 尽可能 ('as far as possible'):

total 6 tokens: 2 in one essay of period II, 1 each in "narrative prose translated", "essays", and "newspaper" in period IV, 1 in "newspaper" in period V

*kěnéngxìng* 可能性 ('possibility'):

total 2 tokens: 2 in one essay of period II.

The table shows that there is a steady increase in the relatively scarce use of *kěnéng* 可能, but not in the use of *kěyǐ* 可以, which reached its peak in period III, or *kě* 可, which was most numerous in period II. Also constructions like those listed above (*...de kěnéng* to *kěnéngxìng*) do not appear much more often in period V than period II. They do not appear, though, in period I.

### 5.3.3 Neologisms

Wang Li mentions comparatively many neologisms in his expositions on the 'Europeanization' of Chinese grammar, e.g. in his sections on polysyllabicity (sections

41 in both chapters 6 by Wang Li, see chapter 5.1.1 of this work), thus including morphology in his discussion of Europeanized grammar. In section 46.1 ("New methods in the usage of pronouns/substitution") he gives another example of novel translations for the English "former" and "latter" - *qiánzhě* 前者 and *hòuzhě* 后者. In *Xiàndài yǔfǎ* (1985: 370) he explains that these substitute the 3rd person pronoun in cases where the use of the latter would cause confusion, in *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* (1984: 486f.) he explains that Chinese originally had nothing like the English demonstrative pronouns "former" and "latter", but that in translations into Chinese "former" was ordinarily translated as *qiánzhě* 前者 and "latter" as *hòuzhě* 后者.

Gunn points out that "*[q]iánzhě* 前者 and *hòuzhě* 后者 existed as phrases prior to the twentieth century, but never with the meaning "the former" or "the latter" in reference to two items identified in sequence within a text. This new cohesive use of these constructions appears to be a loan from English and Europeanized Japanese." (1991: 274)

Xie Yaoji compares two different approaches towards the demonstrative pronouns *qiánzhě* 前者 and *hòuzhě* 后者. "Some people", he writes, "accept them and like to use them, believe them to economize the language" (Xie 2001: 20); but there are "other people who believe that these are not good to use, 'in the first place, they are not at all colloquial, in the second place, because they are not used well, and instead attract misunderstandings'" (Xie: 2001: 20, citing Sun Shuyu and Jin Shenghua 1976: 62).[158]

---

[158] "指示代词"前者、后者",有人接受、喜用,认为可以节省语言,但也有人认为不好使用,"以来并非口语画家,二来因为用得不好,反而容易引起误会"(孙述宇、金圣华 1976,62)。" Xie Yaoji gave the bibliographical data: Sun Shuyu 孙述宇, Jin Shenghua 金圣华: "Yīng yì Zhōng - Yīng Hàn fānyì gàilùn 英译中 - 英汉翻译概论". Xiānggǎng Zhōngwén dàxué xiàowài jìnxiūbù 香港中文大学校外进修部, 1976.

*Qiánzhe* 前者 **and** *hòuzhe* 后者 **in the corpus samples**

**Table 5-32: Frequency of occurrence of** *qiánzhě* 前者 **and** *hòuzhě* 后(後)者

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | average | | average | | average | | average | | average | |
| | Period I | 0 | | 0 | | -- | | 2 | | 2 | |
| | Period II | 0 | | 1 | | *7 | | 1 | | 9 | |
| | Period III | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| | Period IV | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| | Period V | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| | **in all** | **0** | | **2** | | **9** | | **3** | | **14** | |

\* in two samples 2 and 5 occurrences each

Both neologisms, *qiánzhě* 前者 "the former" and *hòuzhě* 后者 "the latter" are evenly distributed (6 occurrences of "the former", 8 occurrences of "the latter"). Again, it is the "essays" register where these novel phrasing appears most often.

# 5.4  Special case: script

On first sight, one should not expect to find instances of 'Europeanization' in character writing. But then, on the other hand, it is the written and not the spoken language where phenomena of 'Europeanization' particularly occur. Two of the most salient features of 'Europeanization' in the written language are the gender discrimination of the 3rd personal pronoun *tā* and the functional discrimination of the structural particle *de*. Both are primarily visible in written language, and audible in spoken language only where their frequency increased.

## 5.4.1  Personal pronoun *tā*

The emergence of gender in third person personal pronouns is one of the features of 'Europeanization' that received most attention. Other than advocated in the first half of

the 20th century, the spoken division into male *tā* 他, female *yī* 伊 and neuter *tuó* 拖 did not establish.[159] Today, all three forms of the 3rd person pronoun are pronounced *tā*.

In *Xiàndài yŭfă*, Wang Li traces the origin of gender discrimination in 3rd person personal pronouns to influence by gender discrimination in English (1985: 365). In *Yŭfă lĭlùn*, he points out that in the case of 3rd person pronoun gender discrimination one should speak of Anglization instead of 'Europeanization', because English generally uses the neutral form for things, whereas in German and French things are referred to in the male, female and neutral form (1984: 477f.). Exceeding English habits, and resembling French or Latin, is the Chinese discrimination of 3rd person pronouns in the plural (as *tāmen* 他们, 她们 and 它们) (*Xiàndài yŭfă* 1985: 365 and *Yŭfă lĭlùn* 1984: 478). As for the starting point of the gender discrimination in 3rd person personal pronouns Wang Li quotes Lin Yutangs estimation 1917 or 1918.[160] He calls this gender discrimination of personal pronouns the most notable of the 'Europeanization' of substitutes.[161] He also notes that for writing the female form of the 3rd person, *tā* 她 won over *yī* 伊 for reasons of pronunciation; for the neutral form, *tā* 它 won over *tā/tuó* 牠, because the former character was already existent in Chinese writing and contained less strokes (*Yŭfă lĭlùn* 1984: 476).

The authors of Beijing Normal University date the emergence of gender discrimination to more or less the same time:

> In original Chinese there is no gender discrimination. But to enhance the accuracy of written language, since May Fourth and under the influence of Indo-European languages, the 3rd person personal pronoun developed in written language the category of gender discrimination. (BNU 1959: 137).

---

[159] See, e.g., Wang Li 1984: 476 f., or the authors of Beijing Normal University, 1959: 137.

[160] 1917 in *Yŭfă lĭlùn* (1984: 476), 1918 in *Xiàndài yŭfă* (1985: 373), both quoting Lin Yutangs 《开明英文文法》 p. 113. Clara Ho-yan Chan, on the other hand, assumes 1920 as the starting point of gender division.

[161] "替代法的欧化，最显著的是人称代词的性别。" (*Yŭfă lĭlùn* 1984: 476).

They, too, note that the spoken discrimination of male *tā* 他, female *yī* 伊, and neutral *tuó* 牠 did not establish itself.

Kubler writes that "in the early years of this century [...] the written forms 她 and 它 came to be used, first in translations from the West and later in original works, to represent, respectively, the feminine 'she' and the neuter 'it'." (Kubler 1985: 75) He also points out the three different plural forms generated by adding the plural marker -*men* 们 to the different forms of the 3rd person pronoun already mentioned by Wang Li, the abortive attempt to use *yī* for female 她 and *tuó* for neuter 它, and the "two variant written forms" of the neuter *tā* "which have not completely stabilized to this day: 它 and 牠." (Kubler 1985: 76)

Gunn points out one of the consequences of this gender discrimination: "The promotion of pronouns distinguishing gender after 1918 resulted in a demonstrable expansion in the cohesive use of pronouns for anaphoric reference." (Gunn 1991: 271)

Xie also stresses the influence of "foreign languages" on the development of masculine, feminine and neuter forms of personal pronouns, as well as on the increase of personal pronouns in general.[162]

He Yang, too, traces the emergence of written gender discrimination to the influence by English and dates it to the time around May Fourth (He 2008: 64). He cites Lü Shuxiang and Wang Li stating that the practice of gender discrimination started in translations (He 2008: 64f.). He observes that the increase of third person personal pronouns can be directly related to their discrimination in writing; because the new disambiguation of the written form allowed the use of the pronoun where formerly this would have been impossible for its ambiguity (He 2008: 71).

---

[162] "人称代词的多用，以至由原本不分性别的"他"衍生出"她、它、牠、祂"，是受了外语结构上的需要及有阳性 (masculine)、阴性 (feminine)、中性 (neuter) 区别的影响（如英语 "he, she, it"）。" Xie 2001: 18.

**Male, female and neutral *tā* in the corpus samples**

**Table 5-33: Male, female and neutral written form of the personal pronoun *tā*, singular and plural forms**

|  |  | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | average |  | average |  | average |  | average |  | average |
| Male *tā* 他(们) | Period I | 124 | *41.3* | 53 | *10.6* | -- | -- | 17 | *3.8* | 194 | *15.5* |
|  | Period II | 156 | *31.2* | 149 | *29.8* | 171 | *42.8* | 6 | *1.3* | 482 | *26.1* |
|  | Period III | 218 | *43.6* | 260 | *52.0* | 221 | *44.2* | 8 | *1.6* | 707 | *35.4* |
|  | Period IV | 207 | *51.8* | 352 | *88.0* | 100 | *33.3* | 72 | *14.4* | 731 | *45.7* |
|  | Period V | 148 | *37.0* | 427 | *85.4* | 227 | *45.4* | 78 | *15.6* | 880 | *46.3* |
|  | **in all** | **853** | *40.6* | **2141** | *89.2* | **719** | *42.3* | **181** | *7.5* | **2994** | *34.8* |
| Female *tā* 她(们) | Period I | 8 | *2.7* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 8 | *0.6* |
|  | Period II | 87 | *17.4* | 21 | *4.2* | 0 | *0* | 0 | *0* | 108 | *5.8* |
|  | Period III | 316 | *63.2* | 186 | *37.2* | 39 | *7.8* | 0 | *0* | 541 | *27.1* |
|  | Period IV | 28 | *7.0* | 108 | *27.0* | 10 | *3.3* | 0 | *0* | 146 | *9.1* |
|  | Period V | 129 | *32.3* | 147 | *29.4* | 19 | *3.8* | 0 | *0* | 295 | *15.5* |
|  | **in all** | **568** | *27.1* | **462** | *19.3* | **68** | *4.0* | **0** | *0* | **1098** | *12.8* |
| Neutral *tā* 它(们) | Period I | 1 | *0.3* | 0 | *0* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 1 | *0.1* |
|  | Period II | 5 | *1.0* | 4 | *0.8* | 2 | *0.5* | 0 | *0* | 11 | *0.6* |
|  | Period III | 34 | *6.8* | 9 | *1.8* | 12 | *2.4* | 0 | *0* | 55 | *2.8* |
|  | Period IV | 12 | *3.0* | 18 | *4.5* | 18 | *6.0* | 15 | *3.0* | 63 | *3.9* |
|  | Period V | 27 | *6.8* | 29 | *5.8* | 27 | *5.4* | 10 | *2.0* | 93 | *4.9* |
|  | **in all** | **79** | *3.8* | **60** | *2.5* | **59** | *3.5* | **25** | *1.0* | **223** | *2.6* |
| All three together | Period I | 133 | *44.3* | 53 | *10.6* | -- | -- | 17 | *3.8* | 203 | *16.2* |
|  | Period II | 248 | *49.6* | 174 | *34.8* | 173 | *43.3* | 6 | *1.3* | 601 | *32.5* |
|  | Period III | 568 | *113.6* | 455 | *91.0* | 272 | *54.4* | 8 | *1.6* | 1303 | *65.2* |
|  | Period IV | 247 | *61.8* | 478 | *119.5* | 128 | *42.7* | 87 | *17.4* | 940 | *58.8* |
|  | Period V | 304 | *76.0* | 603 | *120.6* | 273 | *54.6* | 88 | *17.6* | 1268 | *66.7* |
|  | **in all** | **1500** | *71.4* | **1763** | *73.5* | **846** | *49.8* | **206** | *8.6* | **4315** | *50.2* |

The findings of *yī* 伊 as personal pronoun are not numerous enough to justify their inclusion in table 5-30 - there are 12 tokens in the entire corpus, distributed as follows:
Period I: 1 token of singular *yī* in "narrative prose translated";
period II: 3 tokens of singular *yī* in "narrative prose Chinese", 3 tokens in "narrative prose translated", 2 tokens of singular *yī* and 2 of plural *yīmen* in "essays";

period III: 1 token of singular *yī* in "narrative prose translated".

The other occurrences of *yī* 伊 are used to write foreign names.

The characters 牠 or 牰 used to write the neutral *tā* do not appear in this corpus.

There are altogether 33 (of 86) samples without gender discrimination, using only *tā* 他, but no 她, 它, 伊: 2 in period I, 3 in period II of "narrative prose Chinese"; 5 in period I, 3 in period II, 1 in period III of "narrative prose translated"; 3 in period II, 2 in period III of "essays"; all samples in period I-III of "newspaper".

In spite of the above stated influence of English personal pronouns on written Chinese, the samples of "narrative prose translated" do not contain more or earlier female or neutral 3rd person pronouns. They do contain more than the double of male *tā* 他 than the samples of "narrative prose Chinese" or "essays", but in the case of female *tā* 她 or neutral *tā* 它, "narrative prose Chinese" wins over the translations.

There are some samples written in Colloquial Chinese containing only a few 3rd person personal pronouns,[163] but generally spoken there is a clear correlation between the number of personal pronouns and style: samples of Literary Chinese contain much less *tā* than samples of Colloquial Chinese. In detail and per register the counts are:

**Narrative prose Chinese**

Period I all 3 samples Colloquial Chinese, average 44.3 *tā* per sample.

Period II 2 samples Literary Chinese average 13.5 *tā* per sample, 3 samples Colloquial average 74.7 *tā* per sample.

Periods III-V only Colloquial Chinese.

**Narrative prose translated**

Period I 3 samples Literary Chinese average 4.7 *tā* per sample, 2 samples Colloquial 20 *tā* per sample.

Period II 3 samples Literary Chinese average 8.3 *tā* per sample, 2 samples Colloquial

---

[163] Number of Colloquial Chinese samples with less than 20 occurrences of 3rd person personal pronouns: "Narrative prose Chinese" 1, "narrative prose translated" 1, "essays" 1 sample; newspaper texts generally contain less personal pronouns.

average 76 *tā* per sample.

Period III 1 sample Literary Chinese 8 *tā*, 4 samples Colloquial average 112 *tā* per sample.

Periods IV-V only Colloquial Chinese

**Essays**

Period II 1 sample Literary Chinese 5 *tā*, 3 samples Colloquial average 57.3 *tā* per sample

Periods III-V only Colloquial Chinese

**Newspaper**

Periods I-III Literary Chinese average 2.2 *tā*, periods IV and V Colloquial average 17.5 *tā* per sample.

Here again the division runs along the distinction of Literary and Colloquial Chinese, not along the distinction of originally Chinese and translated texts, nor along periods. On the other hand, the case of male *tā* 他, neutral *tā* 它 and all three *tā* together are some of the rather rare cases where the peak of frequency is in period V - female *tā* 她 was most frequent in period III (175% of period V and tremendous 4,516% of period I).

## 5.4.2 Syntactical marker *de*

Like the gender discrimination of the 3$^{rd}$ person personal pronoun *tā*, the functional discrimination of the syntacical marker *de* is only visible in written language but not audible in spoken language.

Although Wang Li usually tries to avoid using it in his grammar textbook *Zhōngguó xiàndài yǔfǎ*, English is his starting point for the discussion of the structural particle *de* 的. He writes that in translating English, there are three kinds of *de* "的": I): to translate the English *of* and as a marker for the genitive case, like in "*wǒ de péngyou de érzi* 我的朋友的儿子" ("the son of my friend"); II): as marker for adjectives and sentence forms functioning as secondary [attribute, R.C.], like in "*yī gè měilì de shǎonǚ* 一个美丽的少女" ("a beautiful girl") and "*jīntiān zǎoshang dào zhèr lái de nà rén shì wǒ de tóngxué* 今天早上到这儿来的那人是我的同学" ("The man who came here this morning was

my school friend"); III): as marker for tertiaries (adverbs), like in "*tā hěn liúxīn de gōngzuò* 他很留心的工作" ("He works carefully");[164] he adds that in the third case the degree of 'Europeanization' is highest, as this form was originally not much heard in China (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 355). Wang continues:

> Some people think that these three kinds of "*de*" must be differentiated
> and therefore for I) write "的", for II) write "底", for III) write "地". This
> is only Europeanization of written grammar (*wénfǎ* 文法), and has nothing
> to do with spoken grammar (*yǔfǎ* 语法). (*Xiàndài yǔfǎ* 1985: 355)

Wang continues that "底" was not often seen in modern texts, that "的" was commonly used for both cases I) and II), and only the third used "地" (ibid.: 356).

In *Yǔfǎ lǐlùn*, Wang Li first gives a diachronic overview of the structural marker *de* written "底" and "地" since Song dynasty (*Yǔfǎ lǐlùn* 1984: 463f.). He continues that "after modern texts have been Europeanized, some people think that adjectives and adverbs should use different markers" and therefore restored the use of 地 to mark adverbs and adverbial phrases (ibid.: 464). For this reason, western language adverbs or adverbial phrases had to be translated into Chinese using 地 (ibid. 464). In the remainder of this paragraph on *de* Wang discusses the lack of standardization of different characters writing *de*.

The authors from Beijing Normal University discuss *de* 的 as a special preposition in Chinese (Beijing Normal University 1959: 142),[165] which had been given a new differentiating norm since May Fourth to render possible the "clearer and more precise expression of the specific relations between words".[166] In the written form, "*de* 的" expresses the ordinary relation between attribute and noun, "*de* 底" the relation between

---

[164] English translations by Wang Li (1985: 355).

[165] *De* 的 was also treated as preposition (*jiècí* 介词) by Li Jinxi and Liu Shiru in *Hànyǔ yǔfǎ jiàocái* 汉语语法教材 (Teaching materials on Chinese grammar) 1957.

[166] "为了讓它更清楚准确地表示出詞語之间某种特定关系来" Beijing Normal University 1959: 142.

possessive attribute and noun, "*de* 地" the relation between adverbial and verb (or adjective) (BNU 1959: 142). They observe further that, though there was comparatively little disagreement on the distinction between the adverbial marker *de* 地 and the other two *de* (的 and 底), there still were two major opinions on which of these remaining two *de* should be assigned which function, or if they should be differentiated at all. All in all, they regard the divergence of these two *de* (的 and 底) as still unstable and not commonly used. A fourth distinction of the adjectival modifier and sentence final *de* into [之_的],[167] they write, was not acknowledged by society.[168]

Cornelius Kubler recapitulates the above mentioned discussion about the purely written distinction which character should write which function of *de*, ascribing it to "a new sensitivity among the Chinese people to grammar" since around the time of the May Fourth period (Kubler 1985: 58).

Xie Yaoji simply states that "in the aspect of morphological change", the structural particle *de* (的, 地, 得) has its explicit division of labour as grammatical marker for attributes, adverbials and complements respectively (Xie 2001: 18).

He Yang sees a direct relation between the influence of English and other Indo-European languages and the differentiation of Modern Chinese *de* into 的 as attributive marker and 地 as adverbial marker (He 2008: 169). He also points out that a semantic distinction between different structural particles was customary in Tang and Song dynasties but was lost later on (ibid.: 169). The current distinction started after May Fourth under the influence of translating Indo-European languages (ibid. 170).

---

[167] The character comprises the components 之 and 的; it is not part of the available character sets.

[168] "至于其他更细致的分化，如把散动二及由它组成的形容语、句后边的"的"都分化作[之_的]，一开始社会上就没有承認。" Beijing Normal University 1959: 144.

*De* 的/底/地 **in the corpus texts**

**Table 5-34:** *de* 的/底/地 **in the corpus samples**

| | | narrative prose Chinese | | narrative prose translated | | essays | | newspaper | | total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* | | *average* |
| 的 *de* | Period I | 322 | *107.3* | 193 | *38.6* | -- | -- | 3 | *0.7* | 518 | *41.4* |
| | Period II | 747 | *149.4* | 481 | *96.2* | 134 | *33.5* | 6 | *1.3* | 1368 | *73.9* |
| | Period III | 1397 | *279.4* | 920 | *184.0* | 988 | *197.6* | 64 | *12.8* | 3369 | *168.5* |
| | Period IV | 619 | *154.8* | 801 | *200.3* | 665 | *221.7* | 1059 | *211.8* | 3144 | *196.5* |
| | Period V | 811 | *202.8* | 927 | *185.4* | 918 | *183.6* | 897 | *179.4* | 3553 | *187.0* |
| | **in all** | **3896** | *185.5* | **3322** | *138.4* | **2705** | *159.1* | **2029** | *84.5* | **11952** | *139.0* |
| 底 *de/di* [as particle] | Period I | 0 | | 0 | | -- | -- | 0 | | 0 | |
| | Period II | 0 | | 0 | | 133 | * | 0 | | 133 | |
| | Period III | 0 | | 0 | | 36 | ** | 0 | | 36 | |
| | Period IV | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| | Period V | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| | **in all** | **0** | | **0** | | **169** | | **0** | | **0** | |
| 地 *de/di* | Period I | 3 | *1.0* | 2 | *0.4* | -- | -- | 0 | *0* | 5 | *0.4* |
| | Period II | 14 | *2.8* | 27 | *5.4* | 35 | *8.8* | 0 | *0* | 76 | *4.1* |
| | Period III | 125 | *25.0* | 67 | *13.4* | 37 | *7.4* | 2 | *0.4* | 231 | *11.6* |
| | Period IV | 171 | *42.8* | 75 | *18.8* | 43 | *14.3* | 77 | *15.4* | 366 | *22.9* |
| | Period V | 113 | *28.3* | 79 | *15.8* | 64 | *12.8* | 24 | *4.8* | 280 | *14.7* |
| | **in all** | **426** | *20.3* | **250** | *10.4* | **179** | *10.5* | **103** | *4.3* | **958** | *11.1* |

*in two of four samples ** in two of five samples

Particularly striking in the table above is the occurrence of *de* 底 in only four samples out of 86.[169] Secondly, here again the peak is in period IV rather than period V, showing that there is no linear increase, but a reversal in period V. Thirdly, translations do not seem to use structural markers more often: here they come third after "narrative prose Chinese" and "essays".

---

[169] Though this might be a problem of the text samples at hand which possibly have undergone modification in later editions.

# 6 Summary

The results are not as clear or as homogenous as assumed by the earlier authors, with the later exception of Alain Peyraube and He Yang. Neither is the development of Europeanization as continuous. In fact, most of the questions have to be answered with "yes, but…" or "no, but…". Even in those cases where the result seems to be quite straightforward, we have to consider the small size of the corpus and consequently possible biases. The results serve less to prove certain theses, than to remind us that unambiguous answers are very rare. The problem of the earlier authors like Wang Li, BNU (Beijing Normal University) or even Kubler and Xie is that they were looking for Europeanization (or internationalization) and therefore found Europeanization. In the case of Wang Li, we even have an author who first of all tried to establish Europeanized grammar in written Chinese and only afterwards found proof of these changes having taken place.

The results of the respective chapters are summarized below. In chapter 2 the different voices who called for an Europeanization of the Chinese language had their say, a call that included the grammar, for the sake of modernization, as well as the voices of those who criticized and rejected the Europeanization, like Hu Shi and Hertze Ke. Chapter 3 introduced those authors who wrote about the actual Europeanization of Chinese grammar and were cited by Alain Peyraube in his article in 2000, plus Li Chi and BNU. Chapter 4 explained the necessity of building a corpus as well as the specialities of the corpus used in this study. Chapter 5, then, is the main chapter and by far the largest. The instances of Europeanized grammar brought forward by the different authors are grouped, sorted and investigated. The following comprises an overview over the results of this chapter.

Chapter 5.1 on Morphology contains disyllabization, word formation affixes, the plural marker –*men* 们, the progressive aspect marker –*zhe* 着, and new prepositions consisting of verb and conjunction. The first, disyllabization, was widely discussed, by Wang Li, BNU, and Li Chi. Word formation affixes, like the prefix –*fǎn* 反 or the

suffixes *–huà* 化 or *–jiā* 家, are an important subject in all studies on Europeanization, because they proved to be so useful in the formation of the new words that were called for in the modernization movement. They are, though, not evenly distributed over the four registers, but are prevalent in "newspaper" as the most formal register in my corpus, and in period IV. This extension of course has political implications, as period IV was the time of the most fervent campaigns, and the four affixes investigated here were linked to the new language of political movement in Maoist China, whose organ were the newspapers of that time.

The plural marker *–men* 们 was accused of permitting nonsensical sentences like „sānzhūmen hóngmen méiguihuāmen" (三株们红们玫瑰花们: Three red roses), a sentence that was possibly only meant as a joke. By far the highest number of *–men* was reached in essays (average of 32.4 per sample, with an average of 22.0 in the total) and in period IV (average of 39.0 per sample, average of total 22.0), whereas in period V the number of *–men* receded: A peak in periods III or IV and decline in period V is a pattern that is repeated many times in this study. As to the registers, it was used in "translations" slightly more often than in "narrative prose Chinese", and least used in newspapers, with the exception of period IV. Anyway, the boundary between samples with few and samples with many instances of *–men* is not so much along the register division or period division as between literary and colloquial language text samples, and which form dominates the style of respective text sample.

The progressive aspect marker *–zhe* 着 shows a similar pattern, in so far as it increased from period I to III and decreased afterwards in periods IV and V. Here, the largest amount was found in "narrative prose Chinese", with an average of 37.5 per sample in all periods (average of total 23.8) and an average of 55.8 (average of total 32.1) in period III. "Narrative prose translated" and "essays" had their respective highs in periods IV and V – this looks like a spread from "narrative prose Chinese" to "narrative prose translated" and "essays", but not the other way round. *Yǒuzhe* 有着 is still seldom used (14 tokens in the entire corpus), but if it is used, it is so mostly in "narrative prose translated" – here an influence of English "having" might be responsible, as well as an

influence of stabilization and standardization might be responsible for the later decrease of *–zhe* after its earlier rise.

Concerning the expansion of newly coined prepositions consisting of verb and conjunction (对于 *duìyú*, 关于 *guānyú* etc.), Li Chi's assumption that these were chosen because they sounded "bookish" fits in with the observation that they were used most frequently in "newspaper", the most formal of the four evaluated registers.

Chapter 5.2 on Syntax contains nominal phrases with increase of subjects (not investigable), increase of the copula *shì* 是, indefinite and definite article, new usage of pronouns, increase, extension and differentiation of *de* as marker of syntactical relations; verbal phrases with increase and extension of adverbial marker *de*, increase of passive marker *bèi* 被, auxiliary *zài* 在 for progressive aspect; prepositional phrases with *zài* 在 in locative and temporal phrases and other prepositional phrases, clause and sentence with conjunctions connecting clauses and sentences, pronouns as heads, cataphoric use of personal pronouns (not investigable), position of speaker in direct quotations, and the superlative constructions with *zhī yī* 之一. Here, the results can be summarized as follows:

The frequency of *shì* increased only if all samples, Literary and Colloquial, are considered jointly. In colloquial samples alone, the use of *shì* decreased. Also, it did not occur most frequently in "narrative prose translated", as one might expect, but in "essays".

This distinction between Literary and Colloquial samples also plays its role in the distribution of classifiers either serving to translate the European indefinite article or to mark the number. It is least used in the most formal register "newspaper" and most in the experimental "essays", closely followed by "narrative prose Chinese". One should expect that the habit to use "articles" like in European languages first showed in "translations", but this is not the case, at least not in the material of this study. In fact, "translations" only come third after "essays" and "narrative prose Chinese" (see table 5-11). Also, a tendency to mark the number shows in an increase of classifiers, as it did in

the increase of the plural marker –*men* 们 mentioned above. Again, the division is roughly between Literary Chinese dominating the early periods in "narrative prose translated" and in "newspaper", and Colloquial Chinese, dominating the same periods in "narrative prose Chinese" and "essays". The presence or absence of numeral/demonstrative pronoun + classifier can serve as one of the characteristics to separate Colloquial from Literary Chinese.

In the case of the frequency of personal pronouns, "narrative prose translated" leads clearly over "narrative prose Chinese" and "essays", with the exception of the first person pronoun, being predominant in "essays". There is no straightforward increase in their use, but its peak is distributed over periods III (for "narrative prose Chinese" and "essays"), IV ("newspaper"), and V ("narrative prose translated"), thus reaching the one register in direct contact with European languages rather lately. The use of neutral 3rd person pronoun *tā* in the marked plural form *tāmen* 它们, rare as it was, occurred indeed most frequently in "narrative prose translated" (12 tokens of 25 altogether). In the question of neutral *tā* appearing as object or subject (or as both, in pivotal sentences), there is a slight predominance of its use as object (104 tokens) over its use as subject (89 tokens in all), as well as a steady increase from period I to V, concurring with Kubler's observation. Interestingly, the 把 *bǎ*-construction that has no direct equivalent in European languages, appears most frequently in "narrative prose translated" (with an average of 0.5 compared to the average 0.3 in the total using the neutral *tā* and an average of 1.5 compared to the average 0.9 in the total using general/male or female *tā*) – possibly in connection with a new awareness of grammar and a wish for explicitness. In summary, there was an increase in the use of 3rd person personal pronouns, though not in the use of 2nd and 1st person pronouns. This increase of 3rd person pronouns then would be connected with the observation by He Yang that the disambiguation of the written *tā* as 他, 她 or 它 allowed its spread (see chapter 5.4.1).

Concerning the frequency of the syntactical markers *de* (written as 的 or 底) and *zhī* 之, these have to be correlated: A decrease in the use of *zhī* concurs with an increase in the use of *de*, at least in periods I to IV. In period V a backlash sets in. When viewed jointly,

there is an increase in the use of syntactical markers independent from its literary or colloquial form, to an average of 183.4 tokens per sample in the total in period IV, followed by a decrease to 173.6 in period V (163.1 in the average total).

Syntactic changes (not semantic extension) in the use o the passive marker *bèi* 被 show in its increase from period I to III and the following decrease in IV and V as well as in the expression or omission of the agent. The largest number of *bèi* appears in "newspaper" (4.6 tokens/sample compared to 3.6 in the total average) and in period III (5.6 compared to 3.6 in the total average). In "newspaper" also the agent is expressed least (in 34% of all cases), whereas in the total its expression/omission is 50%/50%. In the case of passive marker *bèi*, Peyraube was quite right in asserting that its use would soon stabilize or be rejected. Notable is also that the number of *bèi* is lowest in "narrative prose translated", suggesting that it did not find its way into Chinese via translations.

Similar is the case with *zài* 在) marking the progressive aspect, where "narrative prose translated" (2.5 tokens per sample) is third after "narrative prose Chinese" (4.1 tokens/ sample) and "essays" (3.0 tokens/sample). Kubler and Gunn both suggested that here an influence from southern Chinese languages might be responsible for the increase.

The use of *zài* 在 as preposition in locative phrases increased, like many other phenomena, from period I (6.5 tokens/sample) to IV (28.1 tokens/sample) and decreased again in period V (25.5 tokens/sample). It was mostly used in "narrative prose Chinese" (23.1 tokens/sample), not in "translations" (19.7 tokens/sample), which come only third after "essays" (21.1 tokens/sample). Still, Wang Li's estimation that *zài* was introduced as preposition to fill in the gap opened up by European prepositions in locative phrases, is in accordance with the findings at his time. The use of *zài* in temporal phrases amounts to about one tenth of the locative phrases with *zài*, here again with "narrative prose translated" third after "essays" and "narrative prose Chinese".

The necessity to distinguish Literary and Colloquial text samples shows again in the case of other prepositions. The characters used to write these do not only appear as

prepositions in Colloquial text samples, but some of them also as prepositions or other word classes in Literary text samples. Especially the case of 为/為, pronounced as *wèi* or *wéi*, shows how easily the results can be distorted. It is not only a preposition, or part of a preposition, that was used increasingly in the 20th century, but it is also the verb or co-verb in Literary Chinese. Here again the proportion of Literary/Colloquial text samples has to be taken into account. In the case of "with" – *gēn* 跟, *hé* 和, *hé* 合, *jí* 及, *jiù* 就, *tóng* 同 and *yǔ* 与 – the amount is highest in period IV, second highest in period V, which shows an increase of these prepositions. In the case of "because" – *wèi* 为, *wèile* 为了, *yīn* 因 and *yīnwèi* 因为 – the counts are the other way round: lowest in period IV, second lowest in period V. As two possible reasons for these results there are that a) in period IV the use of Literary Chinese containing a lot of *wéi* 为 had come to its halt or b) that reasoning had come out of fashion. The other prepositions are comparatively rare (115 tokens in all).

Concerning clause connecting conjunctions (copulative, adversative, disjunctive, causal, consecutive, conditional and concessive), there has been a clear decrease. The highest numbers of these conjunctions were reached in periods I or, latest, II. These conjunctions are rarest in periods IV and V. Copulative conjunctions (like *bìng* 并, *ér* 而, *qiě* 且) and conditional/ concessive conjunctions (like *jiǎrú* 假如, *rúguǒ* 如果, *ruò* 若)) were indeed most frequent in "narrative prose translated", but adversative (like *bùguǎn* 不管, *kěshì* 可是, *suīrán* 虽然) and causal/consecutive conjunctions (like *cóng'ér* 从而, *suǒyǐ* 所以, *yīncǐ* 因此) were most frequent in "essays", second most in "translations". The necessity to express the kind of connection between clauses and sentences seems to have become less important throughout the 20th century. Connection became less relevant.

As for the assumption that subordinate clauses starting with *rúguǒ* 如果 or *suīrǎn* 虽然 in Europeanized grammar could follow the main clause, whereas in Chinese "traditional grammar" they could only precede it – this inversion was most commonly the case in "essays" (22% of subordinative clauses following the main clause, in contrast to 78% of

subordinative clauses preceding it) and in "narrative prose translated" (11% of subordinative clauses following the main clause, 89% preceding it), but never in "newspaper". This still is not "quite common", like Kubler (1985: 115) wrote. The case might be different in spoken language, which has a lot of "unplanned sentences" (see Chao Yuen-ren 1968), but in written, planned language it is not predominant, not even in "essays".

Similarly, personal pronouns as heads for adjectival modifiers do not appear particularly often. In the entire corpus there are 12 instances found between 1926 and 1999: five in "narrative prose Chinese" (1926, 1930 twice, 1942 and 1983), five in "narrative prose translated" (1942, 1950, 1993 and 1999 twice), and two in "essays" (1926 and 1999), but none in "newspaper". The two most complex modifying clauses are the two earliest from 1926, one in "narrative prose Chinese", one in "essays", whereas the later modifying clauses are comparatively shorter and simpler.

Chapter 5.3 on lexicon and semantics contains the semantic extension of passive marker *bèi* 被, the extension of potential mood, and neologisms. The results of the semantic extension of *bèi* 被 show a slow development from no positive meaning in period I to 13% positive meaning in period V. The register with most passives marked by *bèi* is "newspaper", containing only negative and neutral, but no positive meanings. "Narrative prose Chinese" contains only one instance of *bèi* with positive meaning, "narrative prose translated" and "essays" contain 6 positive *bèi* each. Here the assumption of an influence by European languages seems reasonable, especially when taking into account Chao Yuen-ren's view that the use of English *by* marking the agent in passive voice might have offered itself also phonetically (Chao 1968: 703) as a loan into Chinese. After all, the highest frequency of *bèi* in a positive meaning is in period V (13% of all *bèi*), as well as the highest frequency of neutral meaning (36% of all *bèi* in that period).

An extension of the potential mood should also show in an increased frequency, but this is not the case. All *kě* 可 taken together, regardless of their being part of polysyllabic words, are most salient in period II in "narrative prose Chinese", and least in

"newspaper" in periods III and V. Considering only the modal verb *kěyǐ* 可以, this is most frequent in "essays" in period III and least in "newspaper" in period II. The composite *kěnéng* 可能 is most frequent in „narrative prose translated" in period IV and least in period I, where it does not appear once. The total of all *kě* 可 shows an average of 14.8 per sample with a peak (19.4) in period II. Looking at the registers, *kě* 可 and *kěnéng* 可能 are most frequent in "narrative prose translated", whereas *kěyǐ* 可以 is most frequent in "essays". Striking is the frequency of all *kě* 可 in period I "newspaper" (15.6 per sample), decreasing afterwards (in period V 6.8/sample). The influence by European or Japanese models was not very strong.

The only neologisms investigated in this study are *qiánzhe* 前者 and *hòuzhe* 后者 with 14 tokens in the entire corpus, resembling so many other rather scarce findings. They are not evenly distributed or do not increase over time, but are most frequent in period II (9 tokens of both *qiánzhe* and *hòuzhe*, 5 of which are found in only one essay), with 2 tokens in period I and 3 tokens in period V. These results reflect more the personal writing style of certain authors than any influential invention.

Chapter 5.4 on the special case of Europeanized inventions in the character script contains the graphic distinction of the personal pronoun(s) *tā* and syntactical marker(s) *de*. The results show again the importance of the division between Literary and Colloquial text samples – any *tā*, male, female, neutral, as personal pronoun emerges much more often in Colloquial than in Literary Chinese. Another result is that female and neuter *tā* are considerably more frequent in "narrative prose Chinese" than in "narrative prose translated", other than expected. Only in the case of male/general *tā* "translations" outnumber the other registers. The high time of female *tā* was period III in all three registers that used it at all: "narrative prose Chinese" with 63.2/sample in period III compared to an average 27.1 in all periods, "narrative prose translated" with 37.2/sample in III compared to 19.3 in all periods, and "essays" with 7.8/sample in III compared to 4.0 in all periods. This distribution reflects what was subject of literature in that time. The peak for neutral *tā* 它 was a little later, and not in all registers at the same time: in "narrative prose Chinese" in periods III and V, in "narrative prose translated" in

period V, in "essays" and "newspaper" in period IV. Another important factor in the distribution of *tā* again is the division between Literary and Colloquial text samples, because Literary texts do not only use less personal pronouns, they also use other characters to write them. All in all, the corpus contains 33 texts samples (of 86) that do not use gender discrimination, but only the male/general *tā* 他, see chapter 5.4.1 of this study. Also, we need to recall He Yang's observation that the diversification of *tā* helped to use it more often where earlier the person had to be called by its name (He 2008: 82 – see chapter 5.2.1.4)

In the case of the written division of the syntactical marker *de*, this marker was most common in "narrative prose Chinese" and in period IV, receding in both cases (的 and 地) in period V. The third graph 底 appears only very rarely in four samples (out of 86). Unfortunately, here as in other cases it is not certain how reliable the editions are from which the text samples had been taken.

At a glance, the results can be condensed into the following table, sorted into changes by register and by period, showing the number of phenomena that reached their peak in the respective register or period.

| register period | narrative prose Chinese | narrative prose translated | essays | newspaper | all |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | 3 | 1 | -- | 1 | 5 |
| II | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 15 |
| III | 11 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 16 |
| IV | 2 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 18 |
| V | 4 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 17 |
| total | 20 | 15 | 26 | 10 | 71 |

According to this table, most changes can be found in "essays", least in "newspaper"; changes increased from period I to IV and decreased slightly in period V.

By far the largest number of changes appears in syntax (chapter 5.2), corresponding to the supposition that Europeanized grammar found its way into Chinese via word-for-word translations or imitation – though not in the register "translations", which comes only in third place.

In total, changes started slowly in period I, gathered momentum until period IV and receded afterwards in period V. Concerning the estimations and the outlook of the authors cited above, they were right as far as they could see in their time, the recession of changes coming only later. The decrease in period V is interesting because of its political implications: the slow return to Chinese tradition since the end of the Maoist era in the late 1970ies.

Did written Chinese change in the 20<sup>th</sup> century? Yes, of course it did, and to a huge extent. One written form was substituted by another written form with its own ways of expression, with its own lexicon and with its own grammar. The new language comprised influences of *guānhuà* 官话 – Mandarin as spoken in Beijing –, of regiolects, of *báihuà* 白话, the language of famous novels, and also of Japanese and European languages, especially in its lexicon. This substitution took place since the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, or possibly even earlier, as many important translations were made at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century already, and it took until the establishment of the People's Republic of China, when inventions became standardized.

Was the grammar of written Chinese Europeanized? There certainly was the wish by some intellectuals to do so, felt as necessity to develop China in every respect, including its language, and make this country fit for the present world and its future. So many people as never before came into contact with other languages and these languages' systems of grammar. The wish to have a modern national language was approached by two ways: the first was the "improvement" of a language that was felt to be backward and dead and useless for modern society, and the second was standardization with the aim to unite the country via unification of its language. European languages were the shining example: the alphabetic writing they had that enabled much larger portions of the population to become literate, the words they had expressing so many new concepts,

and the grammar they had that allowed the precise and unambiguous expression of these new concepts. Concerning the writing, this was not Europeanized, but today's Pinyin is the result of several decades of hot discussion about different systems of phonetic writing, and it has its place in alphabetization and standardization of the pronunciation. Concerning the lexicon, this has been investigated by other scholars. Concerning the grammar, there have been the different statements by Wang Li in pro of an Europeanization and by Peyraube in contra, and this investigation to find out who was right.

As said above, the main outcome is that there is no simple answer. Yes, the Chinese grammar has been Europeanized by its contact with European languages, especially in the many translations, but to a lesser degree than assumed by Wang Li and his followers. And no, the Chinese language had its own pool of different regiolects and different states of language over time and could use these to enliven a language felt to be antique and stuffy, but it made also use of European and Japanese features. It will be very interesting to continue this study in the future and find out what became of recent trends, and it will be equally interesting to investigate the other registers in a larger corpus and have a closer look on the different kinds of text. It would certainly be interesting to compare with a corpus of spoken language. All in all, this study does not end here, but rather starts.

# Literature

Asher, R.E., J.M.Y. Simpson (eds.) (1994): The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Oxford [u.a.]: Pergamon Press

Beijing Normal University / Beijing shifan xueyuan zhongwenxi hanyu jiaoyan zu 北京师范学院中文系汉语教研组: 五四以来汉语书面语言的变迁和发展 Wu si yilai Hanyu shumian yuyan de bianqian he fazhan (Changes and developments in Chinese written language since the May Fourth Movement). Beijing 北京: Shangwu yinshuguan 商务印书馆 1959

Biber, Douglas, Edward Finegan, Dwight Atkinson (1994): "ARCHER and its challenges: Compiling and exploring A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers". In: Udo Fries (Hg.): Creating and using English language corpora. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1-14

Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad, Randi Reppen (2006, 1st ed. 1998): Corpus Linguistics: investigating language structure and use. Cambridge: Cambridge UP

Chan, Clara Ho-Yan (2011): The Europeanization of Modern Written Chinese : A case study of the changing third person pronouns in the twentieth century and beyond. Bern [u.a.]: Peter Lang (European University Studies Series XXI ; Vol. 325)

Chao, Yuen Ren (1968): A grammar of spoken Chinese. Berkeley [u.a.]: University of California Press

Chen, Ping (1999): Modern Chinese. History and Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge UP

Chen Zhanbiao 陈占彪 (2006): 论"五四"文字革命的"欧化"理论 "Lun 'wu si' wen zi ge ming de 'ou hua' li lun". In: 石家庄经济学院学报 Journal of Shijiazhuang University of Economics 6: 832-836

Feng, Chuntian 冯春田, Liang Yuan, Yang Shumin (1997): 王力语言学词典 Wang Li yuyanxue cidian. Shandong 山东: Shandong jiaoyu chubanshe 山东教育出版社

von der Gabelentz, Georg (1953): Chinesische Grammatik. Mit Ausschluss des niederen Stiles und der heutigen Umgangssprache. Leipzig: Weigel (1. Ausg. 1881)

Garvin, Paul L. (1993): "A conceptual framework for the study of language standardization". In: Joshua A. Fishman (Hg.): International Journal of the

Sociology of Language, Vol. 100/101: Anniversary Issue: Preparing for the Twenty-first Century, 37-54

Glück, Helmut (Hg.) (1993): Metzler Lexikon Sprache. Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler

Gunn, Edward (1991): Rewriting Chinese. Style and Innovation in Twentieth-Century Chinese Prose. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford UP

Guo Hongjie 郭鸿杰 (2007): 现代汉语欧化研究综述 "A Literature Review of Europeanization in Modern Standard Chinese". In: 西安外国语学院学报 Journal of Xi'an International Studies University 1: 21-24

He, Yang 贺阳 (2008): "现代汉语欧化语法现象研究" Xiandai Hanyu ouhua yufa xianxiang yanjiu. In: Shijie Hanyu Jiaoxue: Shijie Hanyu Jiaoxue Xuehui jikan 世界汉语教学 4: 16-31

Heine, Bernd, Tania Kuteva (2005): Language contact and grammatical change. Cambridge: Cambridge UP (Cambridge approaches to language contact)

Hickey, Raymond, Merja Kytö, Ian Lancashire, Matti Rissanen (eds.) (1997): Tracing the trail of time. Proceedings from the Second Diachronic Corpora Workshop, New College, University of Toronto, Toronto, May 1995. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi (Language and Computers: Studies in Practical Linguistics No. 18)

Hou, Xuechao 侯学超 (1998): 现代汉语虚词词典 Xiandai Hanyu xuci cidian. Beijing 北京: Beijing Daxue chubanshe 北京大学出版社

Hu, Shi 胡适 (1934): The Chinese Renaissance. Chicago (Ill.): University of Chicago Press (The Haskell Lectures ; 1933)

Jespersen, Otto (1924): The Philosophy of Grammar. London; New York: George Allen & Unwin; Henry Holt and Company (reprinted 1925)

Jia Zhifang 贾植芳, Yu Yuangui 俞元桂 et al. (eds.) (1993): 《中国现代文学总书目》Zhong guo xian dai wen xue zong shu mu . Fuzhou 福州: Fujian jiaoyu chubanshe 福州教育出版社

Kaske, Elisabeth (1999): Mandarin, Vernacular and National Language - China's Emerging Concept of a National Language in the Early 20th Century. (International Conference: Translating Western Knowledge into Late Imperial China, East Asian Department, University of Göttingen, 6-9 December 1999)

Ke, Hertze C.K. (1928) "On the Europeanization of the Chinese language", in: The China Journal IX, 3, September 1928, p. 116-118

Kennedy, Graeme D. (1998): An introduction to corpus linguistics. London: Longman

Klingspon-März, Ingo, Akio Yasui (1979): Überlegungen zum Einfluß westeuropäischer Sprachen auf die Sprachstruktur des modernen Japanisch - Das Problem des "Lehnübersetzungsstils (翻訳借用文体)". (Reprinted from Memoirs of the Faculty of General Education, Kumamoto University. Series of Foreign Languages and Literatures No. 14)

Kohnen, Thomas (1997): "Toward a theoretical foundation of 'text type' in diachronic corpora: Investigations with the Helsinki Corpus". In: Raymond Hickey (Hg.): Tracing the trail of time. Proceedings from the Second Diachronic Corpora Workshop, New College, University of Toronto, Toronto, May 1995. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi, 185-197

Kubler, Cornelius (1985): A Study of Europeanized Grammar in Modern Written Chinese. Taipei: Student Book Co.

Kupfer, Peter (1979): Die Wortarten im modernen Chinesischen. Zur Entwicklung und Etablierung einer grammatischen Kategorie im Rahmen der chinesischen Linguistik. Bonn (Dissertation, Friedrich-Wilhels-Universität Bonn)

Kytö, Merja, Matti Rissanen (1997): "Introduction. Language analysis and diachronic corpora". In: Raymond Hickey (Hg.): Tracing the trail of time. Proceedings from the Second Diachronic Corpora Workshop, New College, University of Toronto, Toronto, May 1995. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi, 9-22

Lass, Roger (1997): Historical Linguistics and Language Change. Cambridge: Cambridge UP (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 81)

Li, Charles N., Sandra A. Thompson (1974): "Co-Verbs in Mandarin Chinese: verbs or prepositions?". In: Journal of Chinese Linguistics = Zhongguo Yuyan Xuebao 3: 257-278

Li, Charles N., Sandra A. Thompson (1981): Mandarin Chinese. A functional reference grammar. Berkeley [u.a.]: University of California Press

Li, Chi (1960): "A Provisional System of Grammar for Teaching Chinese" with Introduction and Commentary. Berkeley: Center for Chinese Studies, Institute of International Studies, University of California (Studies in Chinese Communist Terminology ; 6)

Li, Chi (1960): "Der Einfluss der russischen Sprache auf das moderne Chinesisch". In: Osteuropa 7/8: 500-504

Li, Chi (1962): New Features in Chinese Grammatical Usage. Berkeley: Center for Chinese Studies, Institute of International Studies, University of California (Studies in Chinese Communist Terminology ; 9)

Li, Jinxi 黎錦熙, Liu Shiru 刘世儒 (1957): 汉语语法教材 Hanyu yufa jiaocai 第一编基本规律 di 1 bian ji ben gui lü. Shanghai 上海: Shangwu yinshuguan 商務印書館

Li, Paoguang 李泡光 (ed./主编) (1985): 《全国总书目 1982》, 1983, 1988 Quan guo zong shu mu 1982, 1983, 1988. Beijing 北京: Zhonghua shuju chuban 中华书局出版

Liu, Lydia H. (1995): Translingual Practice. Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity - China, 1900-1937. Stanford: Stanford UP

Liu, Yuehua 刘月华, et al. (2006): 实用现代汉语语法 Shiyong xiandai Hanyu yufa. Beijing 北京: Shangwu yinshuguan 商务印书馆 (增订本 revised and enlarged edition)

Lu Xun 鲁迅 (1981): 鲁迅文集 Lu Xun wen ji. Beijing 北京: Renmin Wenxue chubanshe 人民文學出版社

Lü, Shuxiang 吕叔湘 (Hg.) (1996): 现代汉语八百词 Xiandai hanyu babai ci. Beijing 北京: Shangwu yinshuguan 商务印书馆

Ma, Meng (1963): Recent changes in the Chinese language. A lecture delivered on 18th June, 1962. In: Journal of the Hong Kong Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society: 51-59

Minguo shiqi zongshumu (1911-1949)

Ni, Baoyuan 倪宝元 (1992): 《汉语修辞新篇章 – 从名家改笔中学习修辞》 (Hanyu xiuci xin pianzhang - cong mingjia gaibizhong xuexi xiuci). Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan

Norman, Jerry L. (1988): Chinese. Cambridge: Cambridge UP

Peyraube, Alain (2000): "Westernization of Chinese grammar in the 20th century: myth or reality?". In: Journal of Chinese Linguistics = Zhongguo Yuyan Xuebao 1: 1-25

Qi, Yucun 戚雨村, et al. (Hg.) (1993): 语言学百科辞典 Yu yan xue bai ke ci dian (Enzyklopädisches Wörterbuch der Linguistik). Shanghai: Shanghai Cishu chubanshe 上海辞书出版社

Qu, Qiubai 瞿秋白[Jahr]: "中国文学的古物陈列馆" Zhongguo wenxue de guwu chenlieguan, in: 《瞿秋白文集》 vol. 2, p. 695

Renmin jiaoyu chubanshe shumu 1950-1999

Roetz, Heiner (2006): "Die chinesische Sprache und das chinesische Denken, Positionen einer Debatte". In: (Hg.): Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung; Band 30, München: IUDICIUM, 9-37

Schindelin, Cornelia (2005a): "6. Zur Geschichte quantitativ-linguistischer Forschungen in China". In: Reinhard Köhler (Hg.): Quantitative Linguistik - Quantitative Linguistics. Ein internationales Handbuch. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 96-115

Sun Xixin (1990): "元代指物名词后加'们（每）'的由来" Yuan dai zhi wu ming ci hou jia 'men (mei)' de you lai (The origin of adding 'men (mei)' to nouns denominating things in Yuan dynasty). In: 《中国语文》No. 4, 302-303

Wang, Li 王力 (1954): 论汉族标准语 Lun Han zu biao zhun yu. In: Zhongguo Yuwen 中国语文 6 Zhang, Yanqun 张彦群 (2008): 五四时期欧化翻译的动因及意义 "Wu si shi qi ou hua fan yi de dong yin ji yi yi". In: Henan shifan daxue xuebao (zhexue shehuikexue ban) 河南师范大学学报（哲学社会科学版） 5: 148-150

Wang, Li 王力 (1984): 《中国语法理论》 Zhongguo yufa lilun (Theory of Chinese grammar). Jinan 济南: Shanghai Jiaoyu chubanshe 上海教育出版社 (Wang Li wen ji di 1 juan 王力文集第一卷), 1st ed. 1944-45 by Shangwu yinshuguan, Chongqing

Wang Li 王力 (1985): 《中国现代语法》 Zhongguo xiandai yufa (Modern Chinese Grammar). Beijing 北京: Shangwu yinshuguan 商务印书馆 (汉语语法丛书 Hanyu yufa congshu), 1st ed. 1943-44 by Shangwu yinshuguan, Chongqing

Wang, Li 王力 (1990): 中国文法欧化的可能性 Zhongguo wenfa ouhua de kenengxing (The possibility to europeanize the grammar of written Chinese ). In: 《王力文集》 Wang Li wen ji, vol. 16, Jinan 济南: Shandong jiaoyu chubanshe 山东教育出版社, article originally published in Duli pinglun《独立评论》198 期 (1936.4.13)

Wang, Li 王力 (vol. 20: 1991): 语言的变迁 Yuyan de bianqian (language change). In:《王力文集》 Wang Li wen ji vol. 20, Jinan 济南: Shandong jiaoyu chubanshe 山东教育出版社 (1984-1991), 435-438, article originally published in Duli pinglun《独立评论》132 期 (1934)

Williams, Philip F.C. (2001): "Vernacularization in the Twentieth-Century Essay". In: Victor H. Mair (Hg.): The Columbia history of Chinese literature. New York: Columbia UP, 566-575

Xiandai yufa: see Wang Li 1985

Xiao, Richard (2005): "Some free online Chinese corpora", Corpus4u.org
    <http://www.corpus4u.org/showthread.php?t=233> 2005-05-14 (latest
    access 2010-02-18)

Xiao, Richard (2006): Using corpora to study Classifiers in Mandarin Chinese.
    Power point presentation Berlin, COST Action A31 WG1 Meeting
    <www.lancs.ac.uk/postgrad/xiaoz/papers/Berlin_talk.ppt> 2006-12-08
    (latest access 2010-02-18)

Xie, Yaoji 谢耀基 (1989): 現代漢語歐化語法研究 Xiandai Hanyu ouhua yufa
    yanjiu. Hong Kong University (M.A. thesis)

Xie, Yaoji 谢耀基 (2001): 汉语语法欧化综述 Hanyu yufa ouhua zongshu. In:
    Yuwen yanjiu 语文研究 1: 17-22

Yufa lilun: see Wang Li 1984

Yuyanxue baike cidian 语言学百科辞典 (Encyclopedia of Linguistics) (1993), ed.
    by Qi, Yucun 戚雨村, et al.. Shanghai: Shanghai Cishu chubanshe 上海辞
    书出版社

Zhang, Fengjie 张凤杰 (2009): 汉语欧化语法的历史与现状. In: 中小企业管理
    与科技(下旬刊) Zhong-xiao qiye guanli yu keji (xia xun kan) 8: 119

Zhang, Jie 张劼 (2011): 普通话副词"在"源流考辨 Pǔtōnghuà fuci "zai" yuanliu
    kaobian: An investigation of the origin and evolement of the adverb zai
    (在) in Mandarin. In: Yuyan Jiaoxue yu Yanjiu 语言教学与研究 1: 76-81

Zhou, Zuoren 周作人 (1922): 国粹与欧化 Guocui yu ouhua. In: Zhou Zuoren 周
    作人: 《自己的园地》 Ziji de yuandi, 1923, [...]
    (http://www.wenhuacn.com/wenxue/xd_sanwen/zhouzuoren/56.htm, last
    access 2010-08-26, 15:40)