

Mandarin morphosyntax reading note

Jinyuan Wu

July 18, 2022

This note is my reading note of 朱德熙 (2009). It can be seen as a preparation of [this draft](#), which is premature and possibly will never be finished, especially by someone without systematic linguistic training like me. Still, the theoretical orientation of this note is well introduced in the above link, as well as in [my notes about CGEL](#), [my notes about Latin](#), and [this note about how descriptive grammars work](#). 朱德熙 (2009) is commonly referred to as a typical structuralist book of Chinese. I do not say “structuralist grammar” because the book is also a textbook about structuralism, mostly in Bloomfield’s brand and strikingly close to the The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language (CGEL) (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002) approach summarized in the above notes, with a lot of argumentation, more than what ordinary grammars contain.

1 About Zhu’s book

1.1 The object language

The object language, “Chinese”, needs some clarification. It means Standard Modern Chinese or Standard Modern Mandarin, often abbreviated as Mandarin in the English speaking world. In mainland China it is called 普通话. In Taiwan and Singapore it (with small variations) is called 国语.

Standard Mandarin – like other languages – is an evolving language. Certain usages documented in Zhu’s book have already been obsoleted.

1.2 Organization of chapters

The book can be divided into several parts:

- Chapters 1-6 are about morphology and lexical categories. Lexical categories discussed in details are either nominal or verbal.
- Chapters 7-10 together give a top-down analysis of syntactic constructions without coordination. Serial verb constructions are *not* introduced in these chapters.
- Chapter 11 is about coordination.
- Chapter 12 is about serial verb construction.
- Chapter 13-14 are about prepositions and adverbs.
- Chapter 15 is about clause types.
- Chapter 16 is about sentence final particle (SFP).
- Chapter 17 is about clause linking without canonical coordination.
- Chapter 18 is about ellipsis and inversion, which may be roughly said to be about information packaging.

This organization is an example of § 2.2 in [this note about how descriptive grammars work](#). The relation between the first six chapters and the following four is the item and arrangement strategy relation. Within the chapters 7-10, we see the top-down partition of clauses and NPs introduced in § 3 and § 4 in [this note about how descriptive grammars work](#). This is typical in structuralist works: it is a direct reflection of the top-down analysis of syntactic structures (see § 2.2.2 and § 3 in [this note about how descriptive grammars work](#)).

The noun-verb distinction (§ 2.2.3 in [this note about how descriptive grammars work](#)) is only reflected in nominal categories being introduced in chap. 4, while verbal categories being

introduced in chap. 5. The NP structure is introduced in chap. 10, together with their clausal counterparts.

The relation between the first twelve chapters and chapters 13 and 14 is the relation between canonical constructions and their counterparts with adjunction. The relation between the first fourteen chapters and chap. 15 is the relation between canonical constructions and non-canonical ones related to the former ones by transformation rules.

Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14 constitute a system quite similar to the chapter 4-8 in CGEL: first clausal complements, including the external complement – the subject – and internal complements, then NPs, then how the two are modified, by adjectives and adverbs, or by more complicated PPs.

Chapter 16 actually can be placed before chap. 13. This is not the order used in the book, the reason of which, in generative terms, seems to be that SFPs are merged in higher projections than what is involved from chap. 7 to chap. 15. Zhu, however, regard most of SFPs as a part of the predicate. The contradiction between the arrangement of chapters and the explicit analysis of SFPs as a part of the predicate in § 16.1.1 in 朱德熙 (2009) will be discussed in

1.3 Terminology

The terminology used in the book is closer to the CGEL approach rather than the Basic Linguistic Theory (BLT) approach. It should be noted that the book is written in Mandarin Chinese, in which certain linguistic terms do not have morpheme-to-morpheme counterparts in English or already have different meaning than their morpheme-to-morpheme counterparts in English.

To keep the rest of this note fluent, issues of term translations are summarized in this section.

1.3.1 Word classes

For lexical categories, 体词 means ‘referential word’ i.e. nominal words. Its direct translation would be ‘body-word’, which may be understood by some as ‘content word’ i.e. ‘lexical word’. The term 谓词 means ‘verbal word’. The direct translation would be ‘commenting-word’, which may be understood as somehow “predicative” in the sense of predicative complements in CGEL. This is not correct: 谓词 means what can head a predicate, thus verbs and adjectives in Chinese. The term 实词 ‘substantial word’ means lexical words, while 虚词 ‘virtual word’ means function words.

1.3.2 Clause structure

The term 谓语 means predicate in the CGEL sense. The term 述语 means predicator in the CGEL sense. Unlike earlier structuralist works which work in the vanilla phrase structure grammar (PSG) framework, 朱德熙 (2009) uses a CGEL-like PSG, where a label of a constituent in a larger construction contains both its category label and its function label, for example both “NP” and “subject”. This idea is made explicit in § 1.3.10. The analysis of 我们班有许多外国留学生 in § 1.3.8 is a good example. Unlike CGEL, 朱德熙 (2009) uses a more compact format in which constituents are illustrated by underlining to show the constituency tree. This is, of course, merely a notational problem, but somehow it becomes a tradition of the School Grammar analysis of Chinese.

1.4 About this note

This note try to rearrange the content of 朱德熙 (2009) in a way that is both acceptable in the approaches in BLT and CGEL. The order of this note is largely bottom-up. Certain top-down analyses, of course, will be given in the grammar sketch chapter. When obsolete usages appear, I will point them out. When the analysis is problematic, I will discuss why it is problematic and how it can be improved.

2 Grammar sketch

The first chapter in 朱德熙 (2009) may be thought as a grammar sketch chapter, but it contains much discussion on theoretical issues (replicating what is discussed in CGEL § 1.4). This section

is a more compact grammar sketch, skipping theoretical commitments which can be found in sources at the beginning of this note. Chapter 3 is also a short one and may be regarded as a part of the grammar sketch.

I will roughly follow Jacques (2021) in the organization of this section. However, since in Chinese, dependency relations are not mainly coded by morphology, I will replace the “nominal morphology” section by “noun phrase” and replace the “verbal morphology” section by “clause structure”, and do not give constituent order a special section, since constituent order is covered by the constituency structure. This is a major difference between CGEL-like “structuralist” grammars and BLT-based “functionalist” grammars (§ 1 in [this note about how descriptive grammars work](#)).

2.1 Parts of speech

Since Chinese does not rich grammatical relation-bearing morphology, purely syntactic tests play the major role in determining parts of speech. Semantics may help but is never decisive (§ 3.1.1 and § 3.1.2 in 朱德熙 (2009)). The word class division given in the book inevitably meets the problem that a word may belong to two categories depending on the context.¹ In the analysis adopted here, words belonging to two categories are only the minority, because otherwise, the two categories can be considered as one (§ 3.2, 3.3 in 朱德熙 (2009)).

2.1.1 Lexical words

Lexical words in Chinese can be roughly divided into nominal ones and verbal ones, or in the Chinese terms, 体词 and 谓词 (for issues on translation between English and Chinese terms, see § 1.3.1). The prototypical role of nominal words is to fill argument slots (or to be more precise, to head a phrase that fills an argument slot). Nominal words rarely appear in the predicator position (though for stylistic purposes, they sometimes do). Verbal words prototypically fill argument slots, but many of them – and clauses without any morphological marking – can regularly appear in argument slots (朱德熙, 2009, § 3.5).

The fact that verbal categories can fill argument slots or in colloquial words “be used as nouns” urges some to put the verbal categories under the nominal categories, so thus there is only one mega lexical category in Chinese: the nominal category or the Noun. The analysis adopted here does not aim to organize lexical categories in a binary branching classification tree, so the ordinary nominal-verbal distinction is maintained.

Whether Chinese has a separate adjective category has been debated for decades. Based on a line of reasoning similar to the above verb-as-noun analysis, some linguists argue that the so-called adjectives should be put under the verb category, since they can fill the predicator slot without any morphological marking (Li and Thompson, 1989). Since verbs and most alleged adjectives show different morphological behaviors in duplication (§ 3.2), the verb-adjective distinction is kept, and the two are placed under the verbal category.

There still exist a (much smaller) number of alleged adjectives that shows different morphosyntactic properties with the adjectives in the verbal category. They can be marginally used as heads of NPs, while they do not have duplication variants. These “adjectives” are thus placed under the nominal category. Thus we have two types of adjectives. In 朱德熙 (2009), nominal adjectives are called 区别词 ‘distinction word’, while verbal adjectives are called 形容词 ‘adjective’.

There are more nominal categories than the ordinary noun category and the nominal adjective category. Numerals, for examples, are in another nominal category. Chinese has a rich classifier system, and most classifiers still have strong nominal properties and thus they constitute yet another nominal category. 朱德熙 (2009) calls them 量词 ‘measure word’, because many classifiers have the meaning of “unit”. There is also a location word class, including 里 in 在房子里, which is sometimes said to be the postposition class.

¹Formally, we may say the word prototypically belong to one category, and its usage as a word in another category involves zero derivation or conversion. From a Distributed Morphology perspective, however, we can also say that the stem of that word can be merged with two categorizers, and here we are faced with the same problem that urged linguists to give up transformational rules.

The most appropriate term for this process – zero-derivation, conversion or something else – is still debated, and I will skip this topic in this note.

2.1.2 Function words

Unlike the case in English or Latin (see § 2.2.5 in [my notes about Latin](#)), in Chinese, there is no synchronic or diachronic ways to regularly form adverbs from fossilized phrases or from adjectives via derivations which can be seen as forming a peripheral argument with the meaning of “in the manner of ...”. Thus what can be uncontroversially called adverbs in Chinese form only a small category, which is placed as one type of function words in 朱德熙 (2009).

So-called Chinese prepositions are all historically verbs. The distribution of so-called preposition phrases is also highly restricted, rendering people to ask whether they are constituents at all. Despite 朱德熙 (2009) calls them 介词 ‘adposition’, these words are better regarded as introduced in serial verb constructions (§ 2.3.4), instead of English-like and Latin-like peripheral argument slots. Thus, in this note, I call these “prepositions” *coverbs*, following the terminology in Po-Ching and Rimmington (2015).

Another group of function words in Chinese is the SFP. They are named 语气词 ‘speech force word’ in 朱德熙 (2009), revealing the fact that they are about in the Force projection(s) – though 朱德熙 (2009) somehow insists on them being a part of the predicate (§ 1.2, TODO: more ref).

2.1.3 Overview of all categories

The comprehensive classification of parts of speech can be found in 朱德熙 (2009, § 3.6). Two categories that are neither lexical nor function are the ideophone class and the interjection class.

2.2 Nominal categories, morphology, and the NP

2.2.1 The NP template

No morphological case, number, and gender categories are attested in Chinese. There is a word class system or in other words classifier system, however. In most cases when a numeral appears in a NP, a classifier follows immediately after the numeral. Attributives – both adjectives and relative clauses – follow the classifier. The demonstrative, if any, appears before the numeral, and even when there is no numeral, there is frequently also a classifier.

The template of NPs, therefore, can be summarized as demonstrative–numeral–classifier–attributive(s)–head noun.

2.3 The verb and the clause

2.3.1 The verb

2.3.2 The subject in a clause

Though completely lacking case morphology, Chinese is a typical syntactically accusative language. The structuralist binary branching works well for Chinese clausal structure (朱德熙, 2009, § 133-136). A clause without preposing – henceforth called a nucleus clause – can be divided into a subject and a predicate, plus possible SFPs. The subject is on the left, and the predicate is on the right, followed by SFPs.

2.3.3 Verb complementation patterns

Clausal complements inside the predicate are said to be internal. Internal complements of the verb include objects and non-argument complements (朱德熙, 2009, 1.3.3-1.3.4), the latter being called 补语 ‘complementing speech’ in 朱德熙 (2009). The term 补语 is frequently translated into *complement* in English, but then it conflicts with the wider definition of complements in CGEL, which includes both arguments and 补语, and such confusion occurs, I use the term *non-argument complement*.

We are sure that non-argument complements are not arguments, because they cannot be filled by nominal constituents. They are indeed complements, if not parts of verb compounding constructions, for reasons given in § 10.1.1 in [this draft](#).

Non-argument complements and objects have complicated interplays, and the boundary of non-argument complements is not always clear. Many non-argument complement types are mutually exclusive. The constituent order between some non-argument complements and the

object(s) is rigid, while for other non-argument complements it is more flexible. Certain non-argument complement constructions are almost examples of verb compounding, and the so-called complements may be analyzed as a part of the verb complex. Certain non-argument complements are almost objects.

2.3.4 Serial verb constructions

Chinese has rich serial verb constructions, in which the predicate contains more than one main verbs or possibly a main verb and one or more verbal adjectives and coverbs. The distinction between serial verb constructions and some non-argument complement constructions is highly blurred.

2.3.5 Sentence-final particles

SFPs are actually clause-final particles, because they can appear in subordinate clauses, but since this is the standard term I will not alter it. They appear strictly at the end of nucleus clauses. Postposing to the right of SFPs is rare, if possible.

2.3.6 Unattested constructions and categories

2.4 Negation

Chinese does not have a versatile negator. Negation in

2.5 Coordination, clause linking and supplementation

Coordination occurs in all levels of Chinese syntax: NPs, predicates, and clauses. In these constructions different coordination devices are used.

2.6 Subordination

Like all

2.7 Prosody and styles

2.8 Remarkable features

3 Morphology

3.1 Morphemes

3.2 Duplication

3.3 Affixation

3.4 Compounding

3.5 What is a word?

4 Nominal categories

5 Verbal categories

6 Verb types and clausal dependents

Like the corresponding chapter in CGEL (chap. 4), this section is mainly about canonical clauses. Here “canonical” means the clausal complements transparently displays the argument structure: we only have 王冕经历了父亲的过世, and not 王冕死了父亲. Non-canonical constructions appear only for making argumentation for a complement type (§ 2.4.3 in [this note about how descriptive grammars work](#)). Needless to say, non-canonical usages may be fossilized and become

Table 1: Semantic (and then syntactic) classification of non-argument complements besides quantity complements

| | directional | resultive | possibility | manner and consequence | time and location |
|-----------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| factual | direction complement | result complement | - | manner and consequence complement | time and location complement |
| potential | | potential complement | | - | - |

canonical, as in Old Chinese 示, which is likely to be a fossilized causative construction as in 蔺相如示秦王壁~蔺相如使秦王视璧.

6.1 Subjecthood

6.2 An overview of internal complements

Classification of non-argument complements is a topic full of chaos. A purely semantics-oriented analysis of non-argument complements can be found in Table 1. This is given in (王理嘉 et al., 2004, 5.8). The classification taken in 朱德熙 (2009) is a little different. First, the manner and consequence complement class is divided into 状态补语 ‘state complement’ and 程度补语 ‘degree complement’, because of the imperfect mapping between the semantics and the syntax: the class of 程度补语 origins from grammaticalized direction complements and result complements, and thus its grammatical properties differs from the rest of the manner and consequence complement class (§ 10.1.3.1 in this draft). In this note, I accept *state complement* and *degree complement* as the translations of 状态补语 and 程度补语, respectively.

Another semantic class of non-argument complements often seen in textbooks is 数量补语 ‘quantity complement’ (朱庆明, 2005, § 7.1). The status of quantity complements is kind of controversial. Since quantity complements look like nominal arguments and can occur together with other types of non-argument complements, just like objects do, some authors – including Zhu – kick it from the family of complements and assign various names to it, for example semi-object and time expression. 准宾语 ‘semi-object’ is the name used in 朱德熙 (2009).

The time and location complement class is also absent in 朱德熙 (2009), because it can be easily reanalyzed as an instance of serial verb construction.

In conclusion, the classification of internal clausal complements in 朱德熙 (2009)

6.3 Monotransitive indirect object

7 Sentence final particles

8 Clauses

References

- Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press, 2002. doi: 10.1017/9781316423530.
- Guillaume Jacques. *A grammar of Japhug*, volume 1. Language Science Press, 2021.
- Charles N Li and Sandra A Thompson. *Mandarin Chinese: A functional reference grammar*, volume 3. Univ of California Press, 1989.
- Yip Po-Ching and Don Rimmington. *Chinese: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge, 2015.
- 朱庆明. 现代汉语: 实用语法分析, volume 1. 清华大学出版社有限公司, 2005.
- 朱德熙. 语法讲义. In 朱德熙文集, 第一卷. 商务印书馆, 2009.
- 王理嘉, 陆俭明, 符淮青, 马真, and 苏培成. 现代汉语(重排本). 商务印书馆, 2004.