JANUSZ CHMIELEWSKI

Syntax and Word-Formation in Chinese

I

I feel responsible for the statement that the specifically compositive syllabic morphology (word-formation) in Chinese has mainly developed on the ground of what was syntax (syntactic procedure) in the early stages of the language (roughly corresponding to Archaic Chinese). This statement has been formulated and some of its implications have been discussed in various papers of mine published since 1949. This, of course, does not mean that the statement itself and the diachronic theory connected with it are entirely mine. On the contrary, what I have been doing is simply developing the ideas of some scholars who represented a similar standpoint, and I think that my indebtedness to those scholars — E. D. P o l i v a n o v in the first place — has been clearly acknowledged in my early papers. On the other hand, I believe I have at the same time been sufficiently careful in emphasising the differences between myself and scholars representing opinions incompatible with mine.

In 1954 I had the privilege to read a paper at the Institute of Linguistics of the Academia Sinica in Peking, in which I briefly summarised the main tenets of the theory. The paper — subsequently published in both Chinese and English[1] —

---

met with rather strong criticism from Prof. L u C h ï - w e i, who published a polemical article on the subject a few months later[2]. The whole of my eminent critic's article clearly shows that he considered my theory far-fetched, to say the least. Without entering here upon all the details of his argumentation (an argumentation which, as I think, is not always to the point), I shall limit myself to what I consider pertinent to the main problem. L u C h ï - w e i believes (or at least believed at that time) that the statement about Chinese syllabic morphology (word-formation) as having developed on the ground of what was syntax in early Chinese is untenable — because of its being based on a number of unfounded premises. The premises themselves, according to my critic, are as follows: (1) In early Chinese the main type of word-formative (morphological) procedure was that of sound-alternations (phonemic and tonal) within monosyllabic words; (2) Such alternations have nearly disappeared (sc. as a productive morphological means) from the modern language; (3) In the modern language the main type of word-formative procedure is that operating with syllabic units; (4) In Archaic Chinese this type of procedure belonged, in the main, to syntax. Only one of these premises, (3), is accepted by L u C h ï - w e i ("最符合現實", as he says), while the remaining three are practically speaking rejected for various reasons. Thus, with regard to (1) it is argued that the material hardly allows of any orderly presentation ("資料極難整理"); in this connection the author emphasises the difficulties in distinguishing between dialectal variations and actual alternations, recalls the discrepancies between K a r l- g r e n and C h a n g P i n g - l i n 章炳麟 in their attempts to establish 'families' of cognate monosyllables, etc. Point (2) is strongly rejected ("實在難說") because of the fact (which I never questioned) that there are in present day Pekinese pairs of cognate monosyllables differentiated by tone (or tone + phonemic variation). Point (4) is put to doubt and considered uncertain rather than simply rejected ("不容易確定"), and the author suggests that dissyllabic expressions like *mu k'i* 木器 'wooden implements', *fu mu* 父母 'father (and) mother, parents', etc. — which I cited as instances of Archaic syntactic groupings subsequently morphologised into bisemantemic words — had better be regarded as words (and not as syntactic constructions) on the synchronic plane of Archaic Chinese itself. The implication of all this, of course, is that the conclusion drawn from so many unfounded (if not simply false) premises must itself be false. What is more, L u C h ï - w e i remarks — rather astonishingly — that if we were allowed to accept all four premises

---

misunderstandings. The present remarks have been suggested to me by B. I s a e n- k o's paper *К проблеме границ китайского слова*, published as an appendix to his dictionary (Б. И с а е н к о, *Опыт китайско-русского фонетического словаря*, Moscow 1957; pp. 239—319), *cf.* especially pp. 242—243 and 290.

² 陸志韋, *Kuan-yü Ho-mai-lai-fu-sï-ki sien-sheng-ti "Han-yü-ti kü-fa ho hing-t'ai wen-t'i"* 關于赫邁萊夫斯基先生的 《漢語的句法和形態問題》, *Chung-kuo yü-wen* No. 33, March 1955, pp. 22—24.

(which according to him is not the case), even then the possibility of drawing the conclusion as formulated by me would not be exempt from complications ("還有周折"). In all, it may safely be assumed that as late as 1955 Prof. L u C h ï - w e i rejected the proposal to consider syllabic word-formation in modern Chinese as historically related to syntax.

Leaving aside for a while the factual aspects of L u C h ï - w e i ' s argumentation, let me emphasise that from the formal point of view his argumentation does not adequately render my own line of reasoning nor is itself free from formal (or logical) objections. Thus, it seems to me that my critic contradicts himself a little when he accepts (3) and rejects (2), since (3) and non-(2) are hardly compatible. Second, L u C h ï - w e i wrongly considers (1) — (4) as a set of necessary premises for the main formula. As can easily be seen, if this formula be conceived of as a logical conclusion from a set of premises — and not as a mere statement of fact —, it follows from (3) and (4) alone: if (3) juxtaposition of syllabic units constitutes the main type of word-formative procedure in modern Chinese; and (4) this type of procedure was, in the main, syntactic in early Chinese; then (conclusion) modern Chinese syllabic word-formation diachronically corresponds, in the main, to early syntax, or, in other words, the former has historically developed on the ground of the latter. So it stands in my own article (*cf.* Chinese text, p. 11, col. *b*; English text, p. 83), and L u C h ï - w e i must have misunderstood me on this particular point. As a matter of fact, (1) and (2) are involved in the theory, but in relation to the main formula under discussion they are only corollary statements, not 'premises' in the logical sense of the term. Contrary to L u C h ï - w e i, I am convinced that within the degree of approximation admissible in linguistics both (1) and (2) are as true as (3)—(4), but they need not be discussed here, since from the formal point of view it is only with (3) and (4) that the main formula either stands or falls. Of these, as we know, (3) is accepted by L u C h ï - w e i and hence need not be discussed, while (4) is considered uncertain rather than rejected. These formal considerations show that my conclusion is more fortunately situated than has been suggested by my critic. In fact, the main problem can formally be reduced to that of the validity (or invalidity) of (4). Let me dwell on it for a while, limiting myself to L u C h ï - w e i ' s factual objections which, in the present case, appear to be particularly weak.

To start with, I shall discuss a rather marginal question from among those raised by L u C h ï - w e i. In connection with my examples of dissyllabic expressions common in Archaic Chinese and interpreted by me as syntactic groupings he cites a parallel instance drawn from early texts, — that of *ming k'i* 明器 'sacred implements → objects given to the dead'. L u C h ï - w e i evidently regards this example as a strong piece of evidence against my 'syntactic' interpretation of the early dissyllabic formations, and one showing that such formations attested in Archaic Chinese are not necessarily syntactic even if they are composed of meaningful monosyllables. In the present case, he argues, the monosyllable *ming* has a specific sense, different from that of 'ordinary' *ming* 'bright(ness)' as in *kuang ming* 光明,

and as such it is not a syntactic unit ("沒有單獨用的"). Consequently, it is suggested that the whole dissyllabic complex *ming k'i* — as one containing such a 'bound' monosyllable — must have been a dissyllabic word in Archaic Chinese, and not a syntactic construction. I think that all this, and especially the statement about the monosyllable *ming* (in the sense involved) as lacking syntactic autonomy in early Chinese, is due to some misunderstanding. First, the dissyllabic expression in question has a number of 'isotypes' in early texts (*ming k'i* : *hiung k'i* 凶器 'unlucky implements → funeral implements' : *tsi k'i* 祭器 'sacrificial implements'; *ming k'i* : *ming i* 明衣 'sacred (given to the dead) garments' : *ming shui* 明水 'water given to the dead', etc.), which according to the criteria formulated earlier by L u C h ï - w e i himself (that is, his method of substitution) shows that *ming* (in the semantic function involved) is a word. Second, this *ming* is attested in a position determinative to undeniable syntactic word groups: *ming i shang* 明衣裳 'sacred (used for the dead) upper and lower garments' (*I-li*, several times, ch. 12 and 13); *ming kung shï* 明弓矢 'sacred (given to the dead) bows and arrows' (*Chou-li*, ch. 32), — and hence it must itself be a word. Third, it appears at least once in (verb-)object position, in the *Shï-king*, ode no. 253 (*Min-lao*): 憯不畏明 'those who had no fear of the sacred (= majesty of the king)'[3]. Thus, to my mind, the monosyllable *ming* of *ming k'i* — contrary to what L u C h ï - w e i says — is to be conceived as a syntactic unit in early Chinese, nearly the same as *mu* 木 , *fu* 父 , etc., whose status of syntactic units in the Archaic language is not denied by L u C h ï - w e i. Consequently, *ming k'i* itself can claim to be a (compound) word in early Chinese only in the same sense as *mu k'i* 木器 'wooden implements', *fu mu* 父母 'father (and) mother, parents', etc. can do so. And this, I think, is the core of the problem.

It is precisely the formation 木器 which in my article here under discussion was cited in order to exemplify what I call morphologisation of primary syntactic groupings: Arch. Ch. ****muk k'ĭɛd* 'wooden implements' (syntactic grouping composed of two monosyllabic words, both of which are attested as capable of performing by themselves syntactic functions) > Mod. Ch. *mu-k'i* '(wooden) furniture' (morphologised bisemantemic word composed of two semantemes, or root-morphemes,

---

[3] In both the exemplification and the argumentation I follow H. M a s p e r o, *Le mot ming* 明 , "Journal Asiatique", vol. CCXXIII, no. 2, 1933, pp. 249—296. M a s p e r o argues that the character 明 was used for two different although homophonic words: *ming* 'bright(ness)' and *ming* 'sacred' (with derived meanings: 'used for the dead', etc.). I think that the problem of the linguistic status of the expression *ming k'i* as raised by L u C h ï - w e i is closely connected with and finds a satisfactory solution in this distinction made by M a s p e r o. However, the distinction itself is not universally accepted in Western sinology; for instance, for the *Shï-king* passage quoted, *cf.* B. K a r l g r e n, *The Book of Odes — Ta Ya and Sung*, BMFEA No. 17, 1945, pp. 75—76: "they have not feared the brightness (of the king)."

both without syntactic autonomy in the modern language). Now, my critic suggests that in Archaic Chinese the formation had better be conceived as a word rather than as a syntactic construction. It is argued that the case is comparable to that of *t'ie-lu* 鐵路 'railway' in modern Chinese, which is composed of two mono-syllabic words (that is, units having syntactic autonomy in the modern language) and, none the less, itself is a word. In connection with this, L u C h ï - w e i asks the rhetorical question: if *t'ie-lu* 'railway' is a word in modern Chinese in spite of the undeniable fact that both *t'ie* 'iron' and *lu* 'road' are syntactic units in present day Chinese, why should not Archaic Chinese expressions like *mu k'i* 'wooden implements', *fu mu* 'parents', etc. be considered words, even if we know that *mu* 'tree, wood(en)', *k'i* 'vessel(s), implements', *fu* 'father', *mu* 'mother', etc. were as many syntactic units (words) in the Archaic language?

To my mind, the answer is clear. In modern Chinese, *t'ie-lu* 'railway' certainly is a lexical unit having a specialised meaning — and in this sense it is a word. It is precisely this fact which is important for the lexicographer who, consequently, will have to put the formation into his dictionary as a separate entry. But s t r u c t u r - a l l y the formation is an actual syntactic grouping, since both its members are real words in modern Chinese and the relation binding them up into a whole evidently belongs to the syntactic level (within the syntactic system of the modern language). The *differentia specifica* in the present case is that the whole expression is not an *ad hoc* grouping of words — as syntactic groupings mostly are — but a l e - x i c a l i s e d syntactic construction, associated in this form, and only in this form, with a specialised meaning. This also explains why the formation cannot be expanded *salva significatione* according to L u C h ï - w e i ' s 'method of expansion': as is known, *t'ie-ti lu* 鐵的路 is possible in Chinese, but the grouping thus expanded means 'road (made) of iron', and it goes without saying that *t'ie-lu* (unexpanded) would mean the same if it were an *ad hoc* grouping and had not been lexicalised with the specialised sense of 'railway'. In other words: the impossibility of expanding *t'ie-lu* (*salva significatione*) does not show that structurally *t'ie-lu* is not a syntactic formation; it only shows that *t'ie-lu* is not an *ad hoc* syntactic formation, but a lexicalised one[4]. All this only serves to illustrate the otherwise known facts

---

[4] The same is true with other formations of this kind, for instance, those discussed by B. I s a e n k o (*cf.* his paper mentioned *supra*, p. 108, footnote 1), p. 273. More complicated is the case of the formations like *ho-yü* 河魚 'river-fish, fresh-water fish', etc., which are composed of actual monosyllabic words but cannot possibly be expanded by a simple insertion of the particle of determination *ti* 的. Thus, in the case of *ho-yü* only *ho-li-ti-yü* 河裏的魚 is possible, and sometimes a more complicated procedure must be resorted to, *cf.* I s a e n k o, pp. 272—273. The answer whether such formations structurally are — or are not — syntactic groupings depends on whether we conceive the determinative relation between the components as actually syntactic, or asyntactic (within the synchronic system of the language). It is to be emphasised that the second alternative leads to further complications, since there

which are far from being a peculiarity of Chinese, namely, first, that what structurally is a syntactic grouping can be lexicalised and thus become a lexical unit, second, that not all lexical units (dictionary entries) are morphological (or morphologised) words. It also goes without saying that mere lexicalisation of syntactic groupings should not be confused with morphology or morphologisation of primary syntactic structures[5].

Reverting to the problem of the structural status of the formations *mu k'i* 'wooden implements', *fu mu* 'parents', etc. in Archaic Chinese as discussed by L u C h ï - w e i in his polemical article, it must be emphasised that they are, in fact, comparable to modern Chinese *t'ie-lu* 'railway', although not in the same sense as that suggested by my critic. That is to say, they are structurally syntactic formations which can perhaps claim to be lexicalised customary groupings or 'compound words'. Such 'compound words' in early Chinese, as W.A.C.H. D o b s o n remarks, "are formed by the same structural principles that govern syntagmas" and "differ merely in being customary associations of lexics, in contrast to the spontaneous associations of syntagma made as it were *ad hoc*" (*Late Archaic Chinese*, Toronto 1959, p. 6; *cf.* also his *Early Archaic Chinese*, 1962, pp. 13—14). Thus, the question whether, for instance, *mu k'i* 'wooden implements' is an Archaic (compound) word (as L u C h ï - w e i is inclined to think), or is not (as I think, because of the lack of any specialisation of sense, otherwise characteristic of the lexicalised groupings), is irrelevant

---

are in modern Chinese undeniable determinative syntactic groupings, generally recognised as such, composed of dissyllabic words, which just like *ho-yü* cannot be expanded by *ti* alone. This however only points to the otherwise known fact that *ti* in its function of the exponent of syntactic determination is limited to some sub-types of the relation to the exclusion of other sub-types, or, in other words: *ti* does not cover all the cases of syntactic determination which can be expressed by simple juxtaposition of the words involved. That is why I am inclined to think that formations like *ho-yü* structurally are, after all, syntactic (or perhaps parasyntactic) groupings within the system of present-day Chinese, and not asyntactic ones. On the other hand, there are in modern Chinese formations like *t'ien-ta(-ti)* 天大(的) 'heaven-large, immense', which — although composed of actual words (both *t'ien* 'heaven' and *ta* 'great, large' are syntactic units in the modern language) — are none the less evidently asyntactic structures, since the relation of determination between a noun and an adjective (as the one in the formation now in question) cannot be expressed at the syntactic level of the language by a mere juxtaposition of the words involved. It requires a more complicated construction (*t'ien na-ma ta* 天那麼大 'as large as heavens'), while the simple juxtaposition in such a case (*t'ien ta*) corresponds at the syntactic level to what I call subjection (*cf. infra*, p. 119). These and the like problems, although important, need not be discussed here in full, since they have not been raised by L u C h ï - w e i in his polemical article, to the scope of which the present discussion is deliberately limited.

[5] The distinction is of special importance in Chinese, *cf.* my *Remarques sur le problème des mots dissyllabiques en chinois archaïque*, "Mélanges publiés par l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises", vol. I, Paris 1957; p. 434 and footnote 1.

in this connection, since it has no bearing on the structural status of the formation which — lexicalised or not — structurally was an actual syntactic grouping in early Chinese. The same is true of other expressions mentioned by L u C h ï - w e i, *fu mu* 'father (and) mother, parents', *ts'in ts'i* 親戚 'relative(s)', *men hu* 門戶 'gates (and) doors', etc., which — regardless of whether they were lexicalised or not — s t r u c t u r a l l y constituted as many syntactic formations in early Chinese.

There is in my critic's article one more argument which I fail to understand. Following W a n g I n - c h ï 王引之, he cites several passages from early texts, in which the complex *ts'in ts'i* 'relative(s)' is more specifically meant to refer to *fu mu* 'parents' (or only to *fu* 'father'), while in other contexts the same complex refers less specifically to 'relatives'. I do not know why these examples are interpreted by L u C h ï - w e i as showing that both *fu mu* and *ts'in ts'i* were dissyllabic words (and not syntactic constructions) in the Archaic language. Does this mean that L u C h ï - w e i thinks that if one expression can replace another in the given context, both must necessarily be single words? This however would be an unsound assumption, since within the semantic restrictions, depending on the sense of the formations involved, a syntactic grouping can replace another syntactic grouping just as well as a single word can replace another single word. At any rate, the argument in question is irrelevant to our problem, and probably is due to some misunderstanding[6].

The foregoing discussion is meant to show that my statement (4), although put to doubt by L u C h ï - w e i, cannot be invalidated by his arguments. In fact, it corresponds to that subsequently formulated by D o b s o n, whose investigations embrace the most representative and carefully selected material for two sub-periods of Archaic Chinese. It may safely be assumed that the statement holds good within the structural framework of Archaic Chinese, and since (3) has been accepted by my critic, it follows that the main statement — as implied by the conjunction of (3) and (4) — should be accepted too. A further implication of the main statement is that Chinese compound words, diachronically corresponding to morphologised syntactic groupings (not to speak of actual syntactic formations merely lexicalised), can be best classified according to syntactic criteria, that is, the type of syntactic

---

[6] L u C h ï - w e i reverted to this argument in another place, and put it even more strongly than in his polemical article, namely in his study *The Status of the Word in Chinese Linguistics*, "Beiträge zum Problem des Wortes im Chinesischen", Berlin 1960, pp. 34—47. There he writes: "Even the Chinese student may easily slip into the idea that *fu-mu* and *cin-ci* were phrases [= syntactic groupings, *J. Ch.*] in ancient Chinese, which coalesced into words later on. Then to his chagrin he finds that in some of the oldest texts, *cin-ci* was used as synonymous to *fu-mu* though not vice versa, so on this particular point, a beautiful diachronic theory of the structure of the Chinese language is busted" (p. 35). I presume that the 'beautiful diachronic theory' referred to is mine, but I fail to see any connection between the facts mentioned and the conclusion.

relation binding the monosyllabic components into a whole. However, in the case of true compound bisemantemic words (not in that of lexicalised syntactic groupings) it must be remembered that the intermorphemic (intersemantemic) relations are not simply syntactic: they are only g e n e t i c a l l y syntactic, subsequently shifted to the morphological level of the language, and they synchronically belong to this latter. In other words: the morphologisation of primary syntactic groupings involves the morphologisation of the primary syntactic relations inherent in such groupings. Thus, the main formula is adequate not only to explain historically the curious interpenetration of the two linguistic levels, the syntactic and the morphological (or word-formative), — the interpenetration because of which both levels have so often been badly confused in descriptive grammars of Chinese — and to give an adequate basis for the classification of word-formative types, but also to give us a clue to the distinction between actual syntax and syllabic morphology (word-formation) in modern Chinese[7]. After all, the fact remains that as late as 1955 L u C h ï - w e i for various reasons actually rejected the theory specifically connecting Chinese syllabic word-formation with syntax (in the sense that the former has historically developed from the latter).

Shortly thereafter, in 1957, Prof. L u C h ï - w e i published his important book on word-formation in Chinese[8] in which — not without some contradiction of his previous criticism of my theory — he went much further than I did with regard to the whole problem. Not only are the very arrangement of the book and the classification of word-formative types largely based on syntactic criteria: determination, verb-object relation, etc., — all of which is in perfect agreement with the theory which he previously rejected. What is more, his own methodological standpoint is formulated in the introductory chapter as follows: "From our standpoint, it is better to consider Chinese word-formation as a part of syntax rather than as a part of morphology" (Han-yü-ti kou-ts'ï-fa, p. 2: 據我們看來，漢語的構詞法， 與其說是"形態學"的一部分, 還不如說是結構學的一部分；there

---

[7] There is one clear example of this distinction in my article discussed by L u C h ï - w e i , namely in connection with the relation of determination in mu-k'i, interpreted as syntactic in the formation as it stands in early texts, but only genetically syntactic and morphologised in the modern Chinese continuant of the formation. But the important problem of the main types of syntactic relations in groupings subsequently subjected to morphologisation, as well as the problem of the classification of word-formative types according to criteria genetically syntactic, has been more fully, although briefly, dealt with in one of my papers published in Polish: Różnice między językiem Fang-jen i językiem glos Kuo P'o w ujęciu Wang Kuo-weia [The differences between the language of Fang-yen and the language of Kuo P'o's glosses according to Wang Kuo-wei], "Rozprawy Komisji Językowej Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego", vol. III, Łódź 1955, pp. 113—128.

[8] L u   C h ï - w e i   and others, Han-yü-ti kou-ts'ï-fa 漢語的構詞法, Peking, K'o-hüe ch'u-pan-she, 1957.

is no doubt that the rather unusual term *kie-kou-hüe* refers to syntax, since it is explained by the author himself as *синтаксис* and *tsao-kü-fa* 造句法). Thus, modern Chinese syllabic word-formation — although recognised as a specific part of grammar, and one deserving a specific treatment — has again been entirely dissolved in syntax, in accordance with the traditional "panchronic" viewpoint on Chinese, reducing the whole of Chinese grammar to syntax[9]. Let it also be remarked in this connection that almost simultaneously with Lu Chï-wei's work there appeared in China other publications dealing with syllabic word-formation in a similar way, although on a less extensive scale[10]. It must be left to Lu Chï-wei to decide whether his formula — which certainly is more far-fetched than mine — is compatible with his previous criticism of my theory (for instance, with his rejection of (2)). Another question which remains open is whether this formula, dissolving syllabic word-formation in syntax and involving the treatment of formations composed of sub-syntactic units as actual syntactic structures (or otherwise leading to inconsistencies), is really better founded and more adequate than that which, permitting us as it does to deal with word-formative types in syntactic terms, allows us at the same time to make the distinction between actual synchronic syntax and synchronic word-formation. Without entering into this question now, two important positive facts must be emphasised, namely, that compositive syllabic word-formation has finally acquired its own status within the descriptive grammar of Chinese; second, that syntactic criteria (whatever be their interpretation) have proved to be practically necessary as a basis for the classification of word-formative types. In these two respects (and particularly in the first), Lu Chï-wei's book is fundamental, the more so as it deals with more extensive material than has hitherto been published.

---

[9] *Cf.*, for instance, such important and influential works as Wang Li 王力, *Chung-kuo yü-fa li-lun* 中國語法理論, first published in 1944, in which problems of word-formation are "panchronically" confused with those of actual syntax (they are scattered through various sections designated as being concerned with syntax); and Kao Ming-k'ai 高名凱, *Han-yü yü-fa lun* 漢語語法論, first published in 1948 (for the 2nd ed. of 1957, see the next footnote).

[10] Kao Ming-k'ai, *Han-yü yü-fa lun*, 2nd revised ed., Peking 1957. The author has added a new section on word-formation (non-existent in the first edition of 1948), and he deals with Chinese compound words in much the same way as Lu Chï-wei, see pp. 99 ff. *Cf.* also Sun Ch'ang-sü 孫常叙, *Han-yü ts'i-hui* 漢語詞彙, Ch'ang-ch'un 1957, pp. 100 ff.—The renewed interest in word-formation, so manifest in China for the last years, as well as the very recognition of the fact that word-formation requires a specific treatment within the grammatical system of Chinese, are due to the necessity of solving practical problems involved by the alphabetisation of the script rather than to purely linguistic considerations. This is also explicitly stated in Lu Chï-wei's book (preface, § 2). It seems, however, that such an 'orthographic' point of departure, together with the traditional "panchronic" viewpoint on the grammatical system of Chinese, largely accounts for the inadequacies of the theory.

II

The foregoing discussion has also been intended to show that the problem od rela-
tionship between syntax and word-formation in Chinese, and especially that of
syntactic relations as reflected in word-formation, needs further theoretical elabo-
ration. The preliminary task to be done is that of a systematic classification of the
main types of those relations themselves which occur in Chinese syntactic construc-
tions. This, within the limits of some restrictions to be spoken of *infra,* will be
attempted in the present section.

The problem of such a classification is closely connected with that of establishing
an adequate terminology for the main classes of syntactic relations, since even the
terminology now in use is neither uniform nor systematic. Now, syntactic relations
are, after all, a specific kind of r e l a t i o n s in the logical sense of the term;
they are, strictly speaking, metalogical relations with words and/or word groups
as arguments. In fact, it appears that linguistic descriptions of Chinese (as well as
those of any language) can be formally improved on if more care is taken to make
them fit the requirements of the elementary logical theory of relations. For instance,
it is not always remembered that most syntactic relations (except for co-ordination)
are asymmetric and that the converse of such a relation does not coincide with it.
A good example is that of predication: the relation holds good only between the
predicate (P) and the subject (S), but n o t between S and P. If R represents the
relation *predication,* only PRS holds good, while $*SRP$ is not valid. To make the latter
formula valid, we have to introduce the converse of *predication* ($\check{R}$): $S\check{R}P$, for which
however there is no linguistic term. That is why I have restricted the use of the term
predication to the cases of P-S groupings in which *predication* really occurs, while
introducing the term *subjection* for the converse of *predication,* actually occurring in
ordinary S-P groups (*cf. infra*). Such distinctions are of special importance in a lan-
guage like Chinese, in which mere juxtaposition has always been an important,
although polyvalent, syntactic procedure, and in which word-order has been rigid.
Consequently, it is evident that syntactic relations in Chinese should be defined
uniformly with regard to the first component of the constructions analysed. Second,
it goes without saying that the definition of a syntactic relation should be basically
formal, that is, free from extra-grammatical notions, and should refer to the component
words themselves as the arguments of the given relation, not to anything else (and,
in particular, not to the meaning of the words involved). This condition is not ful-
filled if, for instance, we speak of a 'resultative construction', since it is not the second
word which is the result of the first, but only the action (or state) expressed by the
second component can be conceived as the result of the action expressed by the first.
Moreover, if *resultativity* be used for the corresponding syntactic relation, this use
would also violate the first requirement, that of defining the relations always with
regard to the first component. That is why I use the term *introduction* for the relation
in question (see *infra*).

Limiting ourselves to the simplest syntactic groupings composed of only two 'full'

words, A and B, and leaving out of consideration the 'empty' words, or particles — which would complicate the matter[11] — the syntactic relations occurring in such elementary AB groupings may be tentatively classified in the following way:

1. Co-ordination (corresponding to the Chinese terms *ping-li* 並立 or *ping-lie* 並列)—when both components of the group AB perform the same syntactic function. Consequently, this is the only syntactic relation which is symmetric: its converse is again co-ordination. It follows that the components of co-ordinative groupings are theoretically reversible (BA as equivalent to AB). However, there are limitations due to extragrammatical factors and many co-ordinative groups AB actually cannot take the BA form. This latter fact is important not only at the syntactic level (since it must have led to irreversible customary groupings easily lexicalised), but also at the morphological level: in the case of co-ordinative syntactic formations subsequently morphologised the order of components is, as a rule, fixed. In other words: groupings bound by co-ordination are not always reversible at the syntactic level and they are practically never so at the morphological (word-formative) level[12].

---

[11] The exclusion of the 'empty' or cenematic words from the discussion and the restriction of the present tentative classification of syntactic relations to those between 'full' or plerematic words seem necessary for various reasons. The very distinction of the two categories is not always unambiguous in Chinese and the categories themselves partly overlap; thus, the inclusion of cenematic words would involve a preliminary discussion of this problem. Some cenematic words in Chinese clearly derive from the plerematic ones, but some do not. Consequently, it seems that in the case of groupings composed of a grammaticised cenematic word (that is, one etymologically connected with the corresponding plerematic word) and a true plerematic word the syntactic relation can be identified with that in the corresponding plerematic grouping, — but the case is much more complicated when the cenematic component cannot be interpreted as reducible to a plerematic word. As it seems, even in such groupings the relation can sometimes be defined in terms of that between plerematic words, but on the whole the syntactic relations between true cenematic words and plerematic ones, and especially those between cenematic words themselves, appear to be of a specific kind, different from that of the relations in plerematic groupings. Such relations are also extremely difficult to define in accordance with the aforementioned formal requirements (*cf. supra*, p. 116), and, to my knowledge, they have never been discussed in linguistics (not only in Chinese linguistics) from the point of view adopted here. For instance, the modern Chinese dissyllabic word *êr-ts'ie* 而且 'but also, and also, moreover' is clearly reducible to the early syntactic grouping composed of two cenematic words: *êr ts'ie* 'but also'; it remains an open question how we are to define formally the relation between the components of such a grouping (and the relation between the components of the English equivalent as well).

[12] On the other hand, there are in the modern dialects parallel instances of co-ordinative formations differing in the order of components (BA vs. AB), showing that the formations themselves go back to actually reversible syntactic groupings, *cf.* Y ü a n K i a - h u a 袁家驊 and others, *Han-yü fang-yen kai-yao*: 漢語方言概要, Peking 1960, p. 52, § 45.

Co-ordinative groupings can be further subdivided according to the word class to which the components belong (nominal groupings, verbal groupings) and the syntactic function of the whole. This latter function depends on the word class of the components, but there can occur secondary shiftings (in particular: verbalisation of nominal groupings and, more frequently, nominalisation of verbal groupings). Another subdivision is to be made according to whether the components are synonymic, antonymic, or neither of the two (in the latter case however they must be of the same semantic category).

2. Determination (corresponding to *siu-shī* 修飾 or *hiang-sin* 向心 —the latter Chinese term, evidently rendering B l o o m f i e l d's 'endocentric construction', is inadequate here since B l o o m f i e l d's endocentricism has a wider extension and determination is only a special case of it) — when *A* determines *B*. The converse of the relation is, of course, 'being determined by...', which however need not be taken into consideration since in Chinese the first component cannot be determined by the second. Determinative groupings comprise several sub-types according to semantic and syntactic features of the component words and the syntactic character of the groupings themselves (noun-determination of a noun or adjectival determination of a noun, resulting both in nominal groupings, adverbial determination of a verb, etc.).

3. Rection (corresponding to *tung-pin* 動賓) — when *A* 'governs' *B*. The converse of the relation, 'being governed by ...' (for which perhaps the term *subrection* could be used), can occur with the first component only if this component is marked with a special cenematic word and, consequently, may be left out of consideration here. As far as I know, the very term *rection* is not commonly used in English, but it has a long tradition in grammar and seems convenient as a replacement for the more accurate but unwieldy expression *verb-object relation*. Let it be remarked in this connection that primary rective groupings can easily undergo nominalisation if morphologised.

4. Direction (partly corresponding to *lien-tung-shī* 連動式) — when *A* 'directs' *B*. This term is selected arbitrarily. It is meant to refer to the relations — or better: an otherwise composite class of relations — which occur between verbal *A* and verbal *B* and which for the time being may be defined negatively as not belonging to any other item of the present list. An important case is that of *modal verb+verbal complement*, but other sub-types occur as frequently. It must be emphasised that the delimitation of sub-types within this item and the distinction of these sub-types from those belonging to other major types (co-ordinative verbal groupings, determinative verbal groupings) — as well as the delimitation of syntactic relations occurring between Chinese verbs in general — constitute a particularly difficult problem which needs further research (*cf.* L u C h ï - w e i, *Han-yü-ti kou-ts'ï-fa*, p. 62). The converse of the relation here in question, 'being directed by...', does not occur with the first component of the grouping.

5. Introduction (corresponding to *hou-pu* 後補)—when *A* 'introduces' *B*. This

is again an arbitrary term (*cf. supra*, p. 116), applied here to the syntactic relation be-tween verbal *A* and verbal or adjectival *B* when this *B* represents either what C h a o Y ü a n - j e n 趙元任 called 'resultative complement' or (always in C h a o's ter-minology) 'directional complement' (*cf. Concise Dictionary of Spoken Chinese*, p. xxix). At the word-formative level the relation is represented mostly by formations admitting of specific infixation, which can be regarded as semi-morphologised. The converse of the relation, 'being introduced by...', cannot occur with the first component.

6. Subjection (corresponding to *chu-wei* 主 謂) — when *A* is the subject and *B* its predicate[13], — that is to say, the group is in itself an elementary sentence. The converse of the relation is, of course, predication; it can occur with the *A* com-ponent, see the next item. As has been emphasised by C h a o Y ü a n - j e n, the phonetic and semantic connection between subject and predicate is rather loose in Chinese, *cf.* his *Mandarin Primer*, pp. 34—35. This looseness, together with the specific character of subjective groupings as elementary sentences in themselves, accounts for the fact that such groupings are to a lesser extent subjected to morpho-logisation than those bound up by the aforementioned relations.

7. Predication (for which I would suggest *wei-chu* 謂主 as the Chinese term) — when *A* is the predicate and *B* its subject. The relation can occur only if *A* is an intran-sitive verb, and at the semantic level the whole construction has a slightly different meaning than the corresponding subjective grouping *BA*[14].

8. Exposure (to my knowledge, there is no corresponding term in Chinese) — when the first component is an 'exposed word' in relation to the second component, *cf.* J. M u l l i e, *Structural Principles*, I, p. 155. This otherwise important and at the same time composite item (comprising several sub-types) is included in the list to make it complete; however, it is of little importance, if any, for our present purpose since instances of exposure hardly ever occur in elementary *AB* groupings and the relation is involved in more complicated syntactic structures. It is precisely to this item rather than to subjection *sensu stricto* (that is, ordinary *S—P* construc-

---

[13] For the term itself, *cf. supra*, p. 116. I have introduced the term *subjection* for the converse of *predication* in 1955 (in my aforementioned article, *supra*, p. 114, footnote 7). Let me add that the Chinese term, *chu-wei*, is unambiguous and rightly defines the relation in question as *subject-predicate relation* (not *vice versa*).

[14] The specificity of predicative groupings versus corresponding subjective group-ings has been explained by J. M u l l i e (*The Structural Principles of the Chinese Language*, vol. I, pp. 162 ff.) and A. R y g a l o f f (*La classe nominale en chinois*: *déterminé/indéterminé*, "Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris", LIII, 1; 1958, pp. 306—315) as connected with the indeterminateness of the subject. A. D r a-g u n o v has characterised the predicative construction as expressing statements of facts or processes taken as a whole and non-analysed by the speaker (А. Д р а-г у н о в, *О зависимых членах предложения в современном китайском языке*, "Известия Академии Наук СССР — Отделение Лит. и Яз.", vol. V, 6, 1946, pp. 484—489).

tions) that C h a o   Y ü a n - j e n's characterisation of Chinese sentence-structure as 'topic — comment' should be applied (see his *Notes on Chinese Grammar and Logic*, "Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Congress of Orientalists" — Cambridge 1954, p. 252). The phonetic and semantic connection between an exposed term and the other part of the utterance is particularly loose (*cf*. J. M u l l i e, *l.c.*). It is evident that the converse of the relation cannot occur with the first component.

Objections will probably be raised against both the terminology adopted — which certainly is very arbitrary — and the classification itself. The composite character of some of the major types has already been emphasised, and closer inspection may prove that some of the sub-types deserve to be singled out as separate items. None the less I believe that the foregoing classification, tentative as it is, not only has the advantage of being terminologically uniform, but also gives a sufficiently clear idea of what are the main types of relations actually occurring between plerematic words in elementary syntactic constructions. The classification is also in a certain sense panchronic, since all the relations listed are not only typical of present-day Chinese syntax but are also represented — at least in a rudimentary form or only in some of their sub-types — in the earliest written documents of the Chinese language, that is, the Shang-In inscriptions. For instance, it is not widely known that predicative construction is attested — even if sparingly — in the language of the oracle bone inscriptions.[15] The most controversial point in this respect will probably be the relation which I call *introduction*. It goes without saying that introduction developed into a fully-fledged syntactic category not earlier than the post-classical epoch, but similar instances can be found also in pre-Han texts,[16] and I believe I can show that the introductive construction may be traced back to some rudimentary syntactic groupings attested in the earliest inscriptions. Within the limits such as those just mentioned, we may assume that the foregoing classification constitutes the framework of elementary Chinese syntax (as limited to the simple juxtaposition of only two

---

[15] See K u a n   S i e - c h' u 管變初, *In-k'ü kia-ku k'o-ts'ï-ti yü-fa yen-kiu* 殷虛甲骨刻辭的語法研究, 1953, pp. 16—17, — as against C h' e n M e n g - k i a 陳夢家, *In-k'ü pu-ts'ï tsung-shu* 殷虛卜辭綜述, 1956 (chapter on grammar, pp. 85—134), who failed to notice the predicative construction in the language of the inscriptions (for a somewhat different case of *P-O-S* construction, unnoticed by K u a n   S i e - c h' u, *cf. ibidem*, p. 129). It goes without saying that predicative constructions occur in pre-Han literary texts, for instance in the *Shï-king*.

[16] *Cf*. the important studies by C h o u   C h' ï - m i n g 周遲明: *Han-yü-ti shï-tung-sing fu-shï tung-ts'ï* 漢語的使動性複式動詞, *Shan-tung ta-hüe hüe-pao* 山東大學學報, 1957, No. 1, pp. 187—227; and *Han-yü-ti lien-tung-sing fu-shï tung-ts'ï* 漢語的連動性複式動詞, *Yü-yen yen-kiu* 語言研究, 1957, vol. 2, pp. 23—58. The source-material included and worked up by the author is very rich, but is restricted to literary sources (to the exclusion of the language of the inscriptions).

plerematic words) from the earliest epoch we know of to this day, the difference between the early stages of the language and modern Chinese lying not so much in syntactic categories or elementary syntactic constructions which are largely the same[17], as in the structure of syntactic units themselves, that is, words — which were mostly simple (monosyllabic)[18] in early Chinese and which are mostly complex (polysyllabic, in particular dissyllabic) in the modern language. The latter remark brings us back to the topic already discussed in connection with L u   C h ï - w e i's polemical article and occasionally touched upon in connection with some items of the classification itself. The problem deserves further discussion in the concluding part of this section.

In brief, compositive syllabic word-formation of the modern Chinese language, resulting in complex (mostly dissyllabic) word-structures, largely reflects syntactic relations occurring in elementary AB groupings. It is true that different relations appear in word-formation at different frequency-levels, but what is most important is the fact that practically all the relations listed (except for exposure, which is in some sense heterogeneous in relation to all other items of the list and which for self-evident reasons can hardly be subjected to morphologisation) do appear in dissyllabic (bisemantemic) word-structures of the modern Chinese language and constitute the most adequate, if not the only, basis for the classification of word-formative types. Thus it may be said that the inventory of syntactic relations occurring in elementary AB groupings not only panchronically characterises Chinese syntax but also synchronically characterises modern Chinese word-formation. Co-ordination, determination, rection, introduction and subjection as reflected in word-formation are sufficiently exemplified in L u   C h ï - w e i's *Han-yü-ti kou-ts'i-fa* (and to a lesser extent in other works dealing with word-formation, *cf. supra*, p. 115, footnote 10), but it must be emphasised that closer scrutiny also reveals morphologised or semi-

---

[17] I should like to emphasise that this statement directly concerns only elementary syntactic patterns and the simplest plerematic groupings as previously defined, not the whole of Chinese syntax in its historical perspective. Some Chinese scholars are inclined to exaggerate the historical uniformity of Chinese syntax — broadly conceived as the theory of sentence-construction in general — from the language of the inscriptions to contemporary Chinese (*cf.*, for instance, K u a n   S i e - c h' u, *op. cit.*, p. 51; C h' e n   M e n g - k i a, *op. cit.*, p. 129). Historically, there are considerable differences in the syntax (in the broad sense of the term) of various periods of the language. These differences are mostly connected with diachronic variation in the repertory of cenematic words (entirely omitted form the present discussion) and their syntactic functions. Diachronic differences in constructional patterns themselves are also observable, but they mostly concern details of more complicated (non-elementary) syntactic structures.

[18] 'Simple' means here nothing more than 'monosyllabic', without any negative implication with regard to the internal morphological structure of monosyllabic units in early Chinese; *cf. supra*, p. 108 and p. 109 (on the corollary character of (1)).

morphologised word-structures bound up by what I call direction and predication[19].

The very fact that compositive word-formation reflects syntactic relations is in itself not a peculiarity of Chinese, since some of the relations genetically syntactic (as for instance determination and less frequently rection) are represented in compound words of various languages. But the fact that the syntax of elementary word groups — including those bound up by subjection and predication, that is, elementary sentences of *S-P* and *P-S* type — is reflected in word-formation to so large an extent certainly is a specific feature of Chinese. This also shows that there is a very close historical interrelation between syntax and word-formative syllabic morphology in Chinese, in the sense that word-formation correponds to early syntactic groupings of various kinds. The correspondence in question is twofold: direct or indirect. Thus, some of the bisemantemic word-structures common in modern Chinese and also some of the affixal formations (the latter characterised by specific formal features of their own, as for instance the neutralisation of tone in the suffix) can be directly traced back to early syntactic groupings, attested as such in early texts. In such cases we are fully entitled to speak of the morphologisation of primary syntactic groupings, the more so as the coalescence of the primary syntactic structures into modern words is matched by the reduction of the status of the components (or of one component) from words (syntactic units) to mere semantemes and morphemes (sub-syntactic units). Morphologisation thus realised has certainly been of prime importance for the subsequent development of Chinese syllabic word-formation, and I am glad to see that there is at least one Chinese linguist who seems to share my opinion on this particular point[20]. Again let me add that morphologisation of syntactic groupings is in itself not a peculiarity of Chinese and that similar processes occur in various languages. For instance, in modern Polish — typologically so different from Chinese — the entire paradigm of the preterital forms of verbs is based on what primarily were syntactic groupings (attested as such a few centuries ago) composed of a specific participial form of the given verb plus present tense of the auxiliary verb 'to be' and subsequently morphologised into single word-forms with the second component reduced to an ending-like morpheme. However, it is again the proportion of the cases

---

[19] Directive formations have not been singled out by L u C h ï - w e i as a separate item, *cf. Han-yü-ti kou-ts'ï-fa*, ch. 11 (on 'endocentric verbs'), pp. 62 ff., and predicative formations are entirely omitted from his book. For the relation of predication, *cf.* J. M u l l i e, *Structural Principles*, vol. II—III, pp. 51—53 (where some of the examples concern word-formation of the predicative type).

[20] *Cf.* W a n g L i, *Han-yü shï-kao* 漢語史稿, vol. II, 1958, p. 346. The author emphasises the importance of what he calls 'solidification of phrases' (*le-yü-ti ning-ku-hua* 仂語的凝固化) — which, of course, largely corresponds to what I call morphologisation of primary syntactic groupings — and he does not fail to notice that the process is also fundamental for neological word-formation (*cf. infra*, p. 124).

of actual morphologisation as well as the fact (recognised, as we have seen, also by W a n g L i, *cf. supra*, footnote 20) that they constitute the foundation of syllabic word-formation, which is a peculiarity of Chinese. On the other hand, it is known that word-structures historically corresponding to morphologised syntactic groupings often, possess specific features different from those of the formations genetically morphological (that is, non-derivable from any syntactic structures), since they preserve, as it were, some traces of their former character of syntactic groupings[21]. So it is in Chinese, where besides a considerable number of dissyllabic formations fully morphologised which constitute the strongest core of word-formative morphology (and of which the suffixal ones are perhaps the most representative example) we also have 'weaker' word-structures (mostly verbal) still showing more or less of their syntactic origin (and some specifically limited separability of components in particular). Such apparently embarrassing cases can be best regarded as those of semi-morphologisation, as has occasionally been done in the present paper. What is most important in this connection, however, is not the fact that some border-line cases can be difficult to qualify as morphologised or semi-morphologised, and, on the other hand, as semi-morphologised or syntactic, but the fact that the very existence of such difficulties constitutes an additional argument in favour of the theory deriving Chinese syllabic word-formation from primary syntactic groupings. As a matter of fact, the existence of 'weaker' (semi-morphologised) formations of various kinds among modern Chinese word-structures is not only compatible with the theory, but is in some sense implied by it. It would be an unsound assumption, and one contrary to linguistic experience, to think that if the bulk of modern Chinese complex word-structures derive from syntactic juxtaposition, all these structures must necessarily have been morphologised to the extent equal to that of the formations genetically morphological. Another important point is — and here we revert for a while to the problem of 'indirect correspondence', mentioned *supra*, p. 122 — that by no means all modern Chinese bisemantemic words have such a long history as to be directly traced back to the pre-Han period in which they were actual syntactic group-

---

[21] Reverting to the example of the preterital formations in Polish, we can state that these formations — although certainly morphologised and no longer constituting syntactic groupings within the system of modern Polish — have none the less preserved something of their former character, and that they specifically differ from non-morphologised (genetically morphological) formations. First, some formations within the paradigm are stressed on the antepenult instead of the usual stress which in Polish is on the penult (that is to say, they preserve the stress proper to the first component of the syntactic grouping before the morphologisation of this latter). Second, the formations in question (unlike purely morphological ones) preserve some limited separability of their components; in particular the ending-like morphemes — although without syntactic autonomy — can be detached from the formations themselves and agglutinated to some contextual elements of the actual syntactic construction. *Mutatis mutandis* this is reminiscent of the specifically limited separability of components observable in some Chinese word-structures.

ings. Some can be traced back only to later periods, Han, post-Han, T'ang, etc., and a great many of them are neological formations introduced as late as the end of the nineteenth century or later; some, of course, are recent creations of the last decades. Too little so far is known of the various historical periods of Chinese and of the history of Chinese word-formation in particular[22] for us to answer such questions as, for instance, whether a dissyllabic formation attested in post-Han texts was at that time an actual syntactic grouping (*ad hoc* or lexicalised) or a morphologised (semi-morphologised) one. It also goes without saying that there can hardly be any direct correspondence between neological formations rendering foreign concepts, that is, the *calques* of various kinds, translating foreign terms by means of combinations of Chinese semantemes, and actual early syntactic groupings[23]. Since however such complex formations, whether traceable back to periods later than Archaic Chinese or only recent neologisms, structurally do not differ from those going back to actual syntactic groupings in early Chinese and closely correspond to word-formative patterns derived from early syntactic procedure, they certainly can be conceived as i n d i r e c t l y corresponding to early syntactic groupings. This simply means that a complex (bisemantemic) formation of the kind now in question, if projected onto the synchronic plane of early Chinese, would be nothing else but a syntactic grouping (no matter whether lexicalised or not)[24]. In this light — and in this sense as well — we can say that there is little in modern Chinese syllabic

---

[22] In W a n g L i's three-volume *Han-yü shï-kao*, 1957—1958 (already referred to *supra*, p. 122, footnote 20), which is the only outline of historical Chinese grammar we have, the chapter on *The Development of Word-formation* is comprised in no more than four pages (II, 342—346), and even the author's own statement concerning the 'solidification of phrases' as word-formative process has not been discussed at any length. By the way, the chapter is put at the head of the section entitled *Historical Syntax*.

[23] Not without an important exception, namely, neological formations borrowed from the Sino-Japanese. A considerable amount of such words were coined by the Japanese on the basis of the early Chinese syntactic groupings (attested as such in Chinese texts), which, morphologised in their Sino-Japanese form and endowed by the Japanese with a new sense corresponding to that of the foreign term to be rendered, were subsequently taken over by the Chinese themselves and became current in modern colloquial language. *Cf.* the recent study on the subject by K a o M i n g - k' a i and L i u C h e n g - t' a n 劉正埮, *Hien-tai Han-yü wai-lai-ts'ï yen-kiu* 現代漢語外來詞研究, 1958; see pp. 83—88. In such cases — which, of course, are hardly distinguishable from the formations coined by the Chinese themselves — there is a specific roundabout correspondence between the 're-sinicised' word-structures and the early Chinese syntactic groupings, the intermediate link being the Sino-Japanese.

[24] This, on principle, does not refer to Chinese phonetic transcriptions of foreign words, but again not without some exceptions. Some phonetic transcriptions have been 'semanticised', that is, monosyllabic units have been substituted in such a way as to fit both the phonological shape of the foreign word and its meaning.

word-formation which is not reducible, directly or indirectly, to what formerly was syntactic procedure (for instance, 'emotive' formations of the *shuang-sheng* and *tie-yün* type, some formations of unknown origin, etc.).

But all this, to my mind, does not authorise the linguist entirely to dissolve word-formative morphology into syntax and say that modern Chinese syllabic word-formation (as embracing morphologised and semi-morphologised word-structures, to the exclusion of actual syntactic groupings merely lexicalised) is a part of modern Chinese syntax. After all, synchronic word-formation in Chinese as well as in any other language is mainly concerned with the internal structure of words as units syntactically simple and analysable into non-syntactic or sub-syntactic semantemes and morphemes, while synchronic Chinese syntax is concerned with the structure of actual word groupings and sentences as analysable into syntactic words and syntactic particles. The existence of border-line cases which are difficult to qualify as syntactic or word-formative does not invalidate the fact that syntax and word-formative morphology remain two distinct, although historically closely interrelated, fields of modern Chinese grammar, — the core of syllabic word-formation being the fully morphologised word-structures. On the other hand, as has already been said (*cf. supra*, p. 114), the intermorphemic (intersemantemic) relations discoverable in complex word-structures, morphologised and semi-morphologised (not in lexicalised word groupings) are not simply syntactic: they are g e n e t i c a l l y syntactic, and I have only to repeat the statement that the specific syllabic morphology (word-formation) of the modern Chinese language has grown up on the ground of early syntax — as I formulated it years ago. I also think that Prof. L u C h ï - w e ï's important book — despite his previous criticism of my theory and despite his own methodological formula making Chinese word-formation a part of Chinese syntax — is, on the whole, a good illustration of this statement.