The {*bei*+verb+*jiangqu*} construction in pre-twelfth century Chinese

Its evolution and transcription

Jianqiang Sun
Taizhou University

The Chinese string composed of {*bei* 被 + verb + *jiang* 將 + *qu* 去} is a rare, unique, unproductive, informal usage which, to date, has remained virtually unexplored. The present paper attempts to sketch its pre-twelfth century evolution by analyzing examples collected from various sources, but now from sources digitalized by CBETA (*Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association*). This paper begins by investigating the constituents in order to determine a core structure. It argues that *jiang* and *qu* are not two discrete elements but one single unit, reanalyzed in a new formula, {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} to replace the traditional notation {*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*}.

Regarding the evolution of this collocation, the paper periodizes four stages of development. (1) The earliest examples appear in the fifth century, and they are of the {*bei* + verb$_1$ + verb$_2$ (+ verb$_3$)} order, in which *jiangqu* occupies either the second or third verbal slot. (2) Seventh century examples are showing signs of change, allowing, for the first time, an agent to be inserted between *bei* and the verb. (3) The eighth century witnesses a radical usage shift in which *jiangqu* has been demoted to a SIFE ("Semantically Impoverished Functional Element"), resulting in a new passive order {*bei* + verb + SIFE}. (4) The evolution continues in the ninth through eleventh centuries, becoming more complex, though somewhat dormant. This paper thus contributes to discussion of an understudied and thorny topic: How to segment short strings of Chinese characters. A few guidelines are suggested, and it is noted that some strings consisting of "verb, *jiang*, and *qu*" have been wrongly dissected: {verb + *jiang* + *qu*} must be rendered {verb + *jiangqu*}.

Keywords: {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*}, Chinese passive, evolution, division, transcription, strings, *jiang*, *qu*

1.   Introduction

For the past decade, I have concerned myself with these two Chinese constructs from the ninth and tenth centuries. The first thing to notice is that their passive formations are identical: PM (passive marker) *bei* followed by verb, *jiang*, and *qu*. Furthermore, the data give us valuable clues to the evolution of the Chinese passive.

(1) 窠　被　奪　　將　　去。
    ke　bei　duo　jiang　qu.
    nest PM　snatch take　　go
        BEI VERB *JIANG QU*
    '(My) nest was snatched away by (you).'

(2) 久後　　　總　　被 俗漢　　　弄　　將　　去 在。
    jiuhou　　zong　bei　suhan　　nong　jiang　qu zai.
    long-after always PM　vulgar-man fetch　take　go FP
        BEI AGENT　　VERB *JIANG QU*
    'Eventually, all will be fetched away by the vulgar men.'

These two examples, however, have received very limited attention. Cao (1990: 132) first noted (2) *en passant*. (For Cao's contribution, see Wu (1991); Liu et al. (1992: 64–65); Wei (2013: 876).) Later published literature either revisits (2) or brings (1) to scholarly attention (He 1992a: 240; He 1992b: 160; Feng 1992: 312; Wu 1996: 329; Zhang 2003: 287; Lin 2006: 199). Although He (1992a: 240) has argued that (1) "represents a new development of the *bei* passive," anything substantial has hardly been added to the field to date. Almost all the attestations cited below have not been discussed anywhere else.

This paper is intended to stimulate discussion, starting with the following five talking points. (1) Unearth other cognates and examine their dis/similarities. (2) Analyze their constituents and determine their common core structure. (3) Reject the accepted segmenting {*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*} and re-identify these examples as {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*}. (4) Examine how the {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} use evolved before the twelfth century. (5) Draw implications that can be used for further pursuits. We shall begin with preliminary remarks on procedures.

2.   Data, methods, terms, etc

Examples cited in the present paper date from before the twelfth century. Most of them were extracted from CBETA (Chinese Buddhist Electronic Texts

Association), an NGO established in the 1990s.[1] Additionally, there will be a few examples which I collected over the years from my non-Buddhist readings. These sources are either historical annals or literary works, including the rhymed texts discovered in Dunhuang.

In order to examine these cognates, the paper employs a combination of methods, all of which are widely adopted by academics. Comparison and contrast is one method, fundamental to historical linguistics, whereby features during one period of a language are revealed by comparing such features at a different time period. Guided by this method, the present paper traces the time lapse in order to examine the analytical dimensions, i.e. frequency, semantic feature, sentence structure, grammatical appropriateness, as well as the sources' styles, chronology, and provenance. These dimensions are not only commonly investigated in the literature (Cao 1990; Zhang 2003; Wei 2013), but have also been employed elsewhere by researchers concerned with language change. Frequency of occurrence, for instance, is an important analytical aspect in the field of grammaticalization. As Heine et al. (1991: 38–39) have noted, "In some works, the impression is conveyed that it is its high frequency of occurrence that makes a given lexeme eligible for grammaticalization." At any rate, the analytical procedure of the present paper, utilizing these dimensions and methods, is standard in the field: Study the time, the manner, and the context of the usages in the data.

This paper follows the general practice of analyzing and transcribing tokens. As many others have noted, the Chinese passive exhibits a few salient features which facilitate the analysis of numerous occurrences. First, the passive is conveyed by employing a set of Chinese characters, recognized as passive markers, such as *shou* 受, *de* 得, and *yu* 遇; these PMs, in fact, are conveniently used as labels for the various passive constructions; e.g. the "*shou* order". By consensus, this set – or the Chinese passive – is a rather closed system, with just a dozen characters used as PMs.[2] Naturally, the frequency of attestation of the markers is variable. Amongst the pre-twelfth century markers, the four most common are *yu* 於 (于), *jian* 見, *wei* 為, and *bei*被. Second, the Chinese passive has a clear, linear arrangement, which has undergone hardly any change through the ages. Thanks to this strict linearity, today's scholars can divide the examples into smaller con-

---

1. Thus far, this database has collected 0.2 billion plus characters and keeps expanding by incorporating many other sources including stone inscriptions and local gazetteers. However, its primary source comes from the *Taishō Tripiṭaka*, a definitive edition of Chinese Buddhist canons edited by Junjirō Takakusu and others in the 1920s. For more details, visit its official website: http://www.cbeta.org/.

2. For a short and yet comprehensive list, see Zhang (2010: 60, 63). Yet there must be more markers. Yuan (2005) has recently contended that *meng* 蒙 is also a passive marker and that it had been in use since the first century.

stituents and delve into a common core structure underlying many cognates. More often than not, scholars prefer to label the elements in accordance with their properties (such as part of speech), deriving a formula to represent the core structure, as illustrated by these two passive orders. For literature on the ancient Chinese passive cascading out over past decades, see Bennett (1981), Tang & Zhou (1985a; 1985b), Tang (1987; 1988; 2002), Peyraube (1989), Wang (2004[1957]), and Li (2007).

(3) The {*wei* + agent + verb} order
而 身　為　宋國　　　笑。
er shen wei Songguo　　xiao.
so self PM Song-kingdom ridicule
　　　WEI AGENT　　VERB
'So he was ridiculed by the Song people.'　　　　　　　(Cao 2014: 77)

(4) The {*bei* + agent + verb} order
臣　被　尚書　　召問。
chen bei shangshu zhaowen.
I　　PM minister summon-interrogate
　　BEI AGENT VERB
'I was summoned and interrogated by the minister.'　　　(Cao 2014: 117)

Example (3) is found in the *Hanfeizi (Wudu)* 韓非子·五蠹, a text compiled by Fei Han 韓非 (c. 281–233 BC), a representative of the Legalist School of ancient China. In (3), the marker *wei* is collocated with the agent *Songguo* (the *Song* Kingdom) and the verb *xiao* (ridicule). Similar examples share the core structure {*wei* + agent + verb} order. E.g., (4) appears in a petition submitted to the Chinese throne by Yong Cai 蔡邕 (AD 133–192). It also contains an agent but uses *bei* as the marker. Examples similar to (4) are subsumed under the {*bei* + agent + verb} order.

Admittedly, there are many more orders than what is mentioned above. According to Feng's (1992: 307, 316) study, for instance, more than a dozen *wei* orders and no less than twenty *bei* sequences were used in the seventh through tenth centuries. As further data accumulates, it is reasonable to believe that more and more sequences (such as the {*bei* + verb + SIFE} order examined in the present paper) will be brought to light. (SIFE being an acronym of "semantically impoverished functional element" discussed in § 3.3.)

Before we delve into the technical analysis, it would be helpful here to also mention two similar terms, {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} and {*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*}, both of which are used to transcribe the core structure of the Chinese strings examined hereunder. As suggested, the former is first employed by the present paper, and the latter is the standard formula accepted by the mainstream. Their

difference is: the former takes *jiang* and *qu* as a single unit; the latter as two discrete elements. This nuance may seem picayune, but it is critical and it is one of my contributions. In essence, it reflects different rationales of dealing with *jiang* and *qu* as well as the interrelationship among different elements of the examples. Moreover, this dissimilarity represents a larger, understudied issue which is how to segmentize the Chinese strings containing a few characters. In sum, the aforementioned difference equates to how to slice the examples into parts and determine their common core structure. Given this importance, the topic of divisions, despite some verbosity, is to be discussed twice: first, in § 3, which justifies my transcription; and, second, in § 4, which generalizes a few instructive guidelines for segmenting the Chinese strings.

Finally, a few words on stylistic matters are also necessitated. The present paper adopts the modern Pingyin system to transcribe the characters, devoid, however, of the diacritics that indicate the tones. Moreover, the paper offers interlinear glosses and lines up the characters with the glosses, hence breaking up a few long Chinese sentences. The broken lines, together with elongated spacing, may annoy specialists of Medieval Chinese. However, I find that the alignment not only helps to explicate the structure of the cognates but facilitates an understanding of the tediously technical analysis.

3.   The pre-twelfth century {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} usage

Before I had begun to conduct my research, I had nary an inkling that there would be many dis/similarities amongst the scarce and scattered examples. Yet once these examples are grouped together, their dis/similarities are not so hard to visualize, revealing how the {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} usage gradually evolved between the fifth through eleventh centuries.

3.1   The fifth century

The earliest strings containing *bei*, verb, *jiang* and *qu*, as far as the available sources are concerned, can be traced back to the fifth century. So far, I have found two examples in three different sources, the earliest of which is dated AD 405.

Example (5) is found in the *Dazhidulun* 大智度論, a 100-roll Buddhist text translated by Kumārajīva in 402–405. It occurs in a verse consisting of seven characters in each line. This example is also quoted by the third source the *Xiuxi*

zhiguan zuochan fayao 修習止觀坐禪法要, composed by a monk named Zhiyi 智顗 in the late sixth century:[3]

(5) 如人　　被縛　　將去殺，　災害　垂至　安可眠？
　　 ru ren　bei fu　jiangqu sha,　zaihai　chui zhi　an ke mian?
　　 if people PM tie　take-go kill　calamity near arrive IM can sleep
　　　　　　 BEI VERB₁ VERB₂　VERB₃
　　 'If someone is (to be) tied, taken away and killed, how can he sleep when [such a] calamity is imminent?'　　　　　(http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T25n1509_017)

The second source in which the use is found is the *Sifen lü* 四分律, a sixty-roll Chinese version of the Dharmaguptaka-vinaya made by Yeshe 耶舍 in AD 410–412. In this source, the use occurs in ten sentences. Although all these sentences are slightly different, they do appear to be variations of one sentence. In particular, all the *bei* constructions look very similar. Some of the examples, as a matter of fact, are exactly the same. All the ten occurrences can therefore be seen as one example. For the convenience of further discussion, I quote three sentences.[4]

---

3. All the examples collected from the CBETA database, unless otherwise stated, are referred by their URLs which indicate adequate biographical information. E.g., (5) is quoted from Roll 17 of the *Dazhidulun*, a source that is numbered 1509 and contained in Volume 25 of the *Taishō Tripiṭaka*. For Zhiyi's quotation of (5), see http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/zh-cn/T46n1915_001.

4. In the CBETA's paginated pdf file, (6), (7), and (8) are found on pp. 151, 230, and 264 respectively (http://buddhism.lib.ntu.edu.tw/BDLM/sutra/chi_pdf/sutra11/T22n1428.pdf).
The other seven examples including their page numbers are as follows:

(i) 若為強力所　　持去。若被繫將去。
　　 ruo wei qiangli suo　　chiqu.　ruo bei xi jiangqu.
　　 or PM strong quasi-PM hold-go or PM tie take-go
　　 '(He) can be held by the strong, or be tied and taken away by (someone).'　　(p. 200)

(ii) 或為強力者　將去。(或) 被縛將去。
　　 huo wei qianglizhe jiangqu. (huo) bei fu jiangqu.
　　 or PM strong　take-go or　PM tie take-go
　　 '(He) can be taken away by the strong, or be tied, taken away by (someone).'　　(p. 203)

(iii) 或為強力者所　　執。或被縛將去。
　　 huo wei qianglizhe suo　zhi. huo bei fu jiangqu.
　　 or PM strong　quasi-PM hold or PM tie take-go
　　 '(He) can be held by the strong, or be tied and taken away by (someone).'　　(p. 231)

(iv) 若為強力者所　　執(。) 或被縛將去。
　　 ruo wei qianglizhe suo　zhi(.)　huo bei fu jiangqu.
　　 or PM strong　quasi-PM hold　or PM tie take-go
　　 '(He) can be held by the strong, or be tied and taken away by (someone).'　　(p. 241)

(6) 若　為　力勢　　所　　　持。　若　被　繫縛　　將去。
    ruo wei lishi   suo   <u>chi</u>. ruo bei xifu   jiangqu.
    or PM strong   quasi- PM <u>hold</u> or PM tie   take-go
        WEI AGENT *SUO*   VERB   *BEI* VERB₁ VERB₂
    '(He) can be held by the strong, or be tied and taken away by (someone).'

(7) 或　為　　強力者　所　　　執。或　　被　　縛 將去。
    huo wei   qianglizhe suo   <u>zhi</u>. huo   bei   fu jiangqu.
    or PM   strong   quasi-PM <u>hold</u> or   PM   tie take-go
    WIE AGENT *SUO*   VERB   *BEI* VERB₁ VERB₂
    '(He) can be held by the strong, or be tied and taken away by (someone).'

(8) 或　為　強力者　所　　　將去。或　被　繫　　閉　　　將去。
    huo wei qianglizhe suo   <u>jiangqu</u>. huo bei xi   bi   jiangqu.
    or PM strong   quasi-PM <u>hold</u> or PM tie   detain take-go
        WEI AGENT *SUO*   VERB   *BEI* VERB₁ VERB₂ VERB₃
    '(He) can be taken away by the strong, or be tied, detained and taken away by (someone).'

Despite the rarity, the occurrences exhibit interesting structural similarities, which enable us here to investigation a number of problems the present paper hopes to solve. The critical issues are divide the constituents, transcribe the core structure, determine the nature of *jiangqu*, and explain why *jiang* and *qu* should

---

(v) 或　為 強力者 所　　　執。或 被 縛 將去。
    huo wei qiangli suo   zhi. huo bei fu jiangqu.
    or PM strong quasi-PM hold or PM tie take-go
    '(He) can be held by the strong, or be tied and taken away by (someone).'   (p. 241)

(vi) 或 為 強力者　所　　　執。若 *被* 繫縛 將去。
    huo wei qianglizhe suo   zhi. ruo bei xifu jiangqu.
    or PM strong   quasi-PM hold or PM tie   take-go
    '(He) can be held by the strong, or be tied and taken away by (someone).'   (p. 272)

(vi) 若 為 強力者　所　　　執。若 *被* 繫縛 將去。
    ruo wei qianglizhe suo   zhi. ruo bei xifu jiangqu.
    or PM strong   quasi-PM hold or PM tie   take-go
    '(He) can be held by the strong, or be tied and taken away by (someone).'   (p. 272)

Moreover, how to deal with *suo* of the {*wei* + agent + *suo* + verb} order has not been agreed upon among scholars. Wang (2004: 290) takes *suo* as "the head of the transitive verb" (外動詞 的詞頭) or something like a prefix affixed to the verb. Peyraube (1989: 345–346) claims *suo* and *wei* are "two markers" of which *suo* is used to "mark the verb" whereas *wei* "the agent." Since this order, once deprived of *wei*, hardly conveys the passive, I am inclined to accept *suo* as a quasi-passive marker. Nevertheless, how to gloss *suo* does not impact my analysis.

not be taken as two elements. These questions are interconnected. I shall start my analysis with the last two.

Regarding *jiang* and *qu* in these fifth century AD examples, it must be stressed again that how the present paper differs from the mainstream opinion established since the 1990s lies in the analysis of their interrelationships. Many scholars, as shown in § 4, recognize *jiang* and *qu* as two discrete elements, taking delight in exploring the complicated interrelationships between the two elements including other constituents. This paper however recognizes *jiang* and *qu* as a singularity, claiming that the so-called relationship between *jiang* and *qu* probably does not exist. This study also holds that *jiangqu* is a verb, and that it means "take/bring sth./sb. away (from one location to another)". Nonetheless, this new understanding of *jiangqu* can be explicated through a structural analysis of each data point.

A close look reveals that the arrangement of (6), (7), and (8) are almost identical. Their basic structures are the same and are divided into two parts indicated by the first small round circle in the original Chinese. Speaking of the passive, all the first parts of these three examples are of the abovementioned {*wei* + agent + *suo* + verb} order, and all their second sections are of the *bei* order containing the marker {*bei*, verb, *jiang* and *qu*}. Since *jiangqu* in the *bei* order is to be discussed in great detail, I shall here focus on *jiangqu* in the *wei* order. Clearly, the verb slot of this *wei* order is occupied by *chi* under-dotted in (6) and *zhi* under-dotted in (7). Given the parallel structure, the verb slot of the *wei* order of (8), one can argue, is occupied by *jiang* and *qu*. That is, *jiang* and *qu* in (8) should be taken as one-unit *jiangqu*. This unit is used as a synonym of *chi* in (6) and *zhi* in (7), also encoding the action 'hold' or 'take'. Moreover, the fusion of *jiang* and *qu* as a unit was nothing new in the fifth century. According to scholarly research, *jiang* and *qu* had already been lexicalized and used as a verb no later than the fourth century AD. (For further references, see Cao (1990) and Wei (2013), as well as hereunder.) Nonetheless, should *jiangqu* not be a verb, the *wei* order of (8) would lack a verb, which has been acknowledged as the core indispensable element of a sentence, and (8) would be ungrammatical with no intelligible meaning. As a matter of fact, I have not been aware of any passive construction, neither *wei* nor *bei*, neither *yu* nor *jian*, that does not contain a verb.

In contrast, (5) seems to be the strongest example illustrating that *jiangqu* must be taken as a single unit and that it is a verb in nature. The passive part of (5) is also the *bei* construction. It contains five common characters: 被 *bei* 'by', 縛 *fu* 'tie', 將 *jiang* 'take', 去 *qu* 'go', and 殺 *sha* 'kill'. Since the marker *bei* is obviously a discrete element, how to divide this *bei* passive in fact is translated into how to divide the last four characters. Although I take *jiang* and *qu* as one element and divide these four characters into three constituents: *fu* + *jiangqu* + *sha*,

there are seven more possible ways to slice and dice them; parentheses indicate the division:

Division 1*:   (縛)   (將)   (去)   (殺)
                (*fu*)   (*jiang*)   (*qu*)   (*sha*)
                (tie)   (take)   (go)   (kill)

Division 2*:   (縛將去殺)
                (*fujiangqusha*)
                (tie-take-go-kill)

Division 3*:   (縛將)   (去殺)
                (*fujiang*)   (*qusha*)
                (tie-take)   (go-kill)

Division 4*:   (縛)   (將)   (去殺)
                (*fu*)   (*jiang*)   (*qusha*)
                (tie)   (take)   (go-kill)

Division 5*:   (縛將)   (去)   (殺)
                (*fujiang*)   (*qu*)   (*sha*)
                (tie-take)   (go)   (kill)

Division 6*:   (縛將去)   (殺)
                (*fujiangqu*)   (*sha*)
                (tie-take-go)   (kill)

Division 7*:   (縛)   (將去殺)
                (*fu*)   (*jiangqusha*)
                (tie)   (take-go-kill)

These seven divisions, it must be admitted, are all possible in the realm of theory. In fact, some parts contained in these divisions were actual phrases frequently used in the fifth century Chinese sources. E.g., *fujiang* (the first parts of Division 3* and Division 5*) and *fujiangqu* (the first part of Division 6*) – for more detail about the similar examples, see Wei (2013) as well as § 4 below. None of these divisions works, however. As a matter of fact, some divisions – it must be said – are just plain gibberish.

E.g., Division 1* and Division 2* are unacceptable. They are two extreme ends to divide the Chinese strings. Division 1* is the character-by-character division. This word-by-word reading can be seen in the elementary teaching syllabus throughout the world. But it is quickly abandoned once a few more words have been acquired. The reason is that any string is not composed of unrelated words. A string always consists of words clustered together with certain rules. Therefore, taking all the characters together as a single unit like Division 2* is also bad prac-

tice. Division 2* neither captures nor exposes the interrelationship of different elements.

Similarly, Divisions 3* and 4* are not acceptable either. As just mentioned, language users always follow sets of rules to employ words, producing meaningful, and at least acceptable sentences for successful communication. While slicing up the Chinese strings out of scholarly curiosity, we as researchers shall bear in mind that the constituents must be grammatical as well as meaningful. However, Division 3* and Division 4* contradict common sense. Not all their elements are grammatical. In particular, *qusha* contained in these two divisions is gibberish that makes no sense. The combination of these two characters, to the best of my knowledge, has never been used in any Chinese text or dictionary, ancient or modern. Most likely, therefore, Divisions 3* and 4* never occurred to ancient Chinese people.

Divisions 5*, 6*, and 7* must likewise be discarded. It is important to know that division is not for the sake of division. It must also be emphasized that division will not work with only one example. Division, as mentioned, generates a transcription which is needed and used for the purpose of generalization. Hence division or transcription will work with many cognates. That is, the division of (5) must be able to examine many other examples as well. Yet neither Division 5* nor Division 6* nor Division 7* can do the job because they all destroy the consistent, organizational pattern of all the other examples, which is expounded in § 4.

In contrast, my division {verb + *jiangqu*} seems the most acceptable. Not only does it avoid the above-mentioned pitfalls, but it can also be explained if one turns to a fairly common syntactic phenomenon: the serial verb construction, in which two or more verbs or verbal phrases can be strung together in a single clause to indicate a single event and concurrent or causally related events.[5] As observed by scholars, the serialization usually follows a time sequence, and verbs are clustered together without any intervening conjunction. This is precisely what my transcription of (5) reflects. Its three actions are stacked together and are arranged in a natural time sequence: tie, take away, kill. By analogy, the *bei* order of (8) is also a construction with stacked verbs. Its three verbs are also arranged in the natural progression of time: tie, detain, take away. That is, the *bei* passive in (5) and (8) is of the {*bei* + verb$_1$ + verb$_2$ + verb$_3$} order. This verb serialization used in the Chinese passive – it must also be said – was not new at all in the fifth century. Apart from its use in the *bei* orders, the verb serialization had already been seen in the *wei* and *jian* passives. Examples of the *wei* and *jian* orders with serial verbs, as attested to by statistics offered by historical linguists, do occasionally

---

5. Verb serialization, as concisely pointed out by Haspelmath (2016), is found in many languages.

occur in both Chinese historical annals and translated Buddhist texts made both before and during the fifth century.[6]

In sum, the fifth century examples share one same core and use *jiang* and *qu* as one element, which cannot be divided into smaller constituents. Their core will be recognized as {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*}. In essence, it adopts the {*bei* + verb$_1$ + verb$_2$ (+ verb$_3$)} order, of which the second or the third verb slot is occupied by *jiangqu*. These fifth century examples represent one of the then-common *bei* orders.

3.2   The seventh century

In the seventh century, the usage also remains rare. In total, I have found five examples in three sources.

The first source is the *Foshuo tuoluoni ji jing* 佛說陀羅尼集經 translated by the Indian missionary Atikūṭa 阿地瞿多 in 654. It contains the following two examples.

(9)   遂   被 鬼   神   偷盜   將去。
       sui   bei gui   shen   toudao jiangqu.
       then PM ghost   god   steal   take-go
            BEI AGENT$_1$ AGENT$_2$ VERB$_1$ VERB$_2$
       'Then, (offerings are) stolen and taken away by the ghosts and gods.'
                                    (http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T18n0901_008)

(10)   被 比止(丘) 搦   將去   枷鎖   縛。
       bei biqiu   nuo   jiangqu jiasuo fu.
       PM Bhiksu   seize   take-go cangue bind
       BEI AGENT VERB$_1$ VERB$_2$ VERB$_3$
       '(He is) seized, taken away and bound to a cangue by Bhiksu.'
                                    (http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T18n0901_010)

The second text is the *Fayuanzhulin* 法苑珠林, a collection of pious Buddhist stories compiled by Shi Daoshi 釋道世 in AD 668. It also produces two examples. However, the first one quotes (5), and the other one is (11) used in a sentence that recounts Shancai Xu's adventure on his way home in AD 619.[7]

---

6. For instance, Xiao (2012: 43–44, 56, 64–65, 70, 72, 76, 84, 87, 89, 93) has collected 59 {*jian* + verb$_1$ + verb$_2$} cases in the historical accounts composed between AD 25 and 618. For more detail, see also Cao (2014: 145, 168, 177, 187, 193, 199, 305).

7. While quoting (5) in Roll 71, this source incorrectly writes *bei* 被 as *bi* 彼: 如人彼(被)縛將 去殺 (http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/ko/T53n2122_071). The nature of *zhi* in (11) is yet to be determined. Wang (2005: 110–113) argues *zhi* is a transitive verb, meaning 'reach, arrive, approach'.

(11)　道　　逢　　胡賊。被　捉　　　將去。　　至　　幽州　　南界　　　　胡賊
　　　dao feng　huzei. bei zhuo　jiangqu.　zhi　Binzhou nanjie　　huzei
　　　road across bandit　PM　catch　take-go　　PREP Binzhou south-border bandit
　　　　　　　　　　　　　BEI VERB₁ VERB₂ (?)

　　　凶毒所。
　　　xiongdusuo.
　　　filthy-den

　　　'On the way (home), (Shancai Xu) came across bandits, was caught and <u>taken</u>
　　　<u>away (?)</u> (by them) to the southern border of Binzhou where their filthy den
　　　was located.'　　　　　　　　　　(http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/ko/T53n2122_065)

The third source is the *Dasheng xianshi jing* 大乘顯識經 rendered into Chinese
by Divākara 地婆訶羅 in 680. It only contains one example.

(12)　如被　劫賊　　執捉　　將去，　　作　如是言：
　　　ru bei jiezei　zhizhuo jiangqu,　zuo rushiyan:
　　　if　PM　robber　catch　take-go　say like-word
　　　　　BEI AGENT VERB₁　VERB₂ (?)
　　　'If (you are) caught and <u>taken away (?)</u> by robbers, say these (*sūtra*) teachings
　　　(for blessing):'　　　　　　　　(http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T12n0347_002)

Compared with the fifth century, the examples of the seventh century have under-
gone interesting developments. I shall discuss three important ones.

　　　First, the use increased a little bit in terms of style. As shown, all the pre-
seventh century files are Chinese versions of Buddhist *sūtras*. In essence, they are
of one style, namely the religious canon. In the seventh century, however, the use
has been expanding into such non-religious texts as the *Fayuanzhulin*. Although it
is compiled by a Buddhist monk, the *Fayuanzhulin* is far from a religious source.
As attested to by the abovementioned story of the layman Shancai Xu, who saved
his life by reciting Buddhist *sūtras*, the *Fayuanzhulin* at best can be seen as the
Buddhist catechetical material with a strong purpose to win more converts. In a
strict sense, however, it is a collection of stories, having nothing to do with Bud-
dhist *sūtras*. Nevertheless, the source style is an important dimension to examine
the growth of the use. As it becomes more and more clear, the use keeps expand-
ing into sources of more diverse styles in later periods.

Recently, however, more and more researchers find that Wang's claim is general. In some exam-
ples (Luo & Yao 2017: 33–34), *zhi* has undergone significant changes and should be taken as a
preposition which is used after a verb in order to specify a location or the direction of the action
coded by the verb. E.g., *zhi* in (11) is arranged after *zhuo* 'catch' and *jiangqu* 'take away', indi-
cating Shancai Xu was brought to another location, which is the bandits' den. For more details
about the evolution of the Chinese prepositions, see Zhang (2002).

Second, the use became complex in terms of structure. The complexity can be illustrated by the insertion of the agent between the marker *bei* and the verb. In the pre-seventh century period, none of the examples contain an agent. Among the five examples of the seventh century, however, two examples allow the agent to be placed between *bei* and the verb. In (9), for instance, *guishen* 'ghosts and gods' is inserted between *bei* and *toudao* 'steal'. In (10), the agent *biqiu* 'Bhiksu' is used after the passive marker *bei* and before the first verb *nuo* 'seize'. Here, it is important to know that the insertion of agent represents the impressive growth of the *bei* passive in general. As observed by scholars, the *bei* passive is less frequently used than the *yu, jian*, and *wei* passives in the pre-seventh century period. Moreover, the early *bei* passive is of a simple structure, and its oldest order {*bei* + verb} remain common for centuries without much of any significant change. Since the seventh century or the Tang dynasty, however, the *bei* passive rose quickly. *Bei* is more frequently employed than the other passive markers. Meanwhile, the *bei* passive also became complex. Its earliest simple order {*bei* + verb} declined. More and more *bei* examples are found inserted with agent. The new form {*bei* + agent + verb} survived past the other orders. Peyraube (1989: 355) writes: "This form which has hardly emerged in EMC [Early Medieval Chinese, *c.* 221–589 AD], becomes predominant under the Tang [dynasty] to be the most common passive structure."

Third, *jiangqu* also experienced slight change, and its verbal nature seems to be weakening as indicated by the question marks inserted in the glosses. On the one hand, *jiangqu* in (9) and (10) is a verb, still retaining its primary nature and coding the action 'take/bring away to another location'. On the other hand, one can make a case by arguing that *jiangqu* does not sound like a verb; removing it does not alter much of the meaning. When (11) is deprived of *jiangqu*, for instance, its new string "被捉至豳州南界胡賊凶毒所" (*bei-zhuo-zhi-Bingzhou-nanjie-huzei-xiongdusuo*) does not drastically and semantically differ from the original. In this new string, *jiangqu*'s function seems to be taken over by the character *zhi* which means 'arrive at someplace' and thus also embeds the action 'take/bring away to another place'. In addition, the {verb + *zhi*} usage including *zhuo-zhi* (捉至) has already appeared long before the seventh century; for the {verb + *zhi*} use, see Luo & Yao (2017). Like (11), (12) can also be deprived of *jiangqu*. When encountering dangers, disasters, and even difficulties, one does not spend much time in thinking whether or not they should seek protection from a deity. Almost all humans will not hesitate to take comfort in chanting religious hymns for blessings while being robbed. Very few just begin to say auspicious prayers until they have been taken away (*jiangqu*) by the criminals. Following this line of reasoning, one may find that *jiangqu* in (12) does not seem like the verb 'to take away'.

In sum, the {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} usage underwent change in the seventh century AD. The use can be found in various sources. An agent can be inserted into the order for the first time; that gives us the {*bei* + agent + verb₁ + verb₂} order. Interestingly, the verbal nature of *jiangqu*, albeit disputable, is less felt in the seventh century than in the fifth century. Yet for more readily apparent changes in use, we have to turn our attention to the next century.

3.3   The eighth century

From the five sources cited below, I have found seven occurrences of the phenomena under consideration, within the given timeframe. The changes are quite remarkable, in contrast to earlier times.

Our first source is the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye* 根本說一切有部毗奈耶, the Chinese version of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*. Its second roll contains three cases (http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T23n1442_002). Although they seem to be one usage, I quote them all for further analysis.

(13) 見 一大木　　　被 截　　將去(。)
　　　jian yidamu　　　bei jie　　jiangqu(.)
　　　see one-NUM.CL-log PM cut　　away
　　　　　　　　　　　　BEI VERB SIFE
　　　'(He) saw that a huge log had been cut away by (someone.)'

(14) 見 一大木　　　被 截　　將去。
　　　jian yidamu　　　bei jie　　jiangqu.
　　　see one-NUM.CL-log PM cut　　*away*
　　　　　　　　　　　　BEI VERB SIFE
　　　'(He) saw that a huge log had been cut away by (someone).'

(15) 遂　被 他人　　斬截　將去。
　　　sui　bei taren　　zhanjie jiangqu.
　　　then PM 3P　　cut　　away
　　　　BEI AGENT VERB　SIFE
　　　'Then, (the huge log) had been cut away by someone.'

The second text is the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye posengshi* 根本說一切有部毗奈耶破僧事, the Chinese version of *the Saṅghabhedavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*. It contributes one example occurring in Roll 13 (http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T24n1450_013):

(16) 必　　被　國王　　盡 取　　將去。
     bi   bei guowang jin qu   jiangqu.
     must PM king   all take away
            BEI AGENT   VERB SIFE
     '(The possessions) all will be taken away by the King.'

The third source is the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye yaoshi* 根本說一切有部
毘奈耶藥事, the *Bhaiṣajya-vastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya.* Its Roll 13 also
contributes one case (http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T24n1448_013):

(17) 象　　　被 風　　吹　　將去。
     xiang   bei feng   chui jiangqu.
     elephant PM wind   blow away
            BEI AGENT VERB SIFE
     'The elephant was blown away by wind.'

The fourth text is the *Jingang banruo jing jiyanji* 金剛般若經集驗記. It gives us
(18) (http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/X87n1629_001).

(18) (崔文簡)　　　被 捉　　將去。吐蕃 鎖 著。防護　　極　　嚴。
     (Cui Wenjian) *bei zhuo jiangqu.Tubo suo zhe. fanghu ji   yan.*
     (Cui Wenjian) PM catch away   Tibet lock ASPM security ADV.D tight
                BEI VERB SIFE
     '(The military officer Cui Wenjian) was arrested by (Tibet). Tibet locked (him)
     up under extremely tight security.'

The fifth source (Wang 1989: 4040) is a petition containing an example:

(19) 臣　國內　　庫藏　　珍寶　　及　部落 百姓　物　　　並　　　被
     chen guonei kucang zhenbao ji   buluo baixing wu   bing   bei
     I   country treasury valuable and tribe people possession together PM
                                                                BEI
     大食　　徵稅　　將去。
     Dashi   zhengshui jiangqu.
     Arabs   levy-tax away
     AGENT VERB   SIFE
     'The valuables in the treasury of my country and the possessions of the tribes
     and the people, all were levied as taxes by the Arabs.'

Regarding these eighth century examples, three points of development should
attract our attention.

     The first point is that the usage kept rising in an upward curve. All these texts
stem from the eighth century AD. The first three texts belong to a series of San-
skrit Buddhist *sūtras* entitled *the Mūlasarvāstivāda.* They were brought back to
China and were translated in Xi'an and Luoyang by Yi Jing 義淨 (635–713 AD),

another eminent Chinese pilgrim who embarked on his journey to India in 671 and finally returned to China in 695.[8] The very first is dated 703. The other two were made no later than 712, when advancing age prevented Yi Jing from taking on more work (Wang 1996: 20, 22, 25). The fourth source is an anthology of stories collected by pious Buddhist believers. It was written in Zizhou 梓州 where its author, Xianzhong Meng 孟獻忠, was serving as an official in the southwestern province of Sichuan 四川 in 718. The fifth text is a petition sent by Naluoyan 那羅延, the king of Jumi 俱蜜 (present-day Tajikistan), who requested the assistance of the Tang court to resist the invading Arabs. Although whether this petition was sent directly from Central Asia or had been drawn up by ambassadors in the Tang capital remains unknown, it is documented that this request was submitted in the year 719 AD or the seventh year of the Kaiyuan Reign 開元七年, according to the Chinese calendar. Given this large territory and these different styles of sources, the {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} usage (one might claim) had been spreading in the eighth century.

The second development is that by the eighth century AD the string composed of {*bei*, verb and *jiangqu*} no longer seems to have been constrained by the principle of semantic resemblance, whereas, before this time, the use had unquestionably been governed by this principle. In every clear pre-eighth century example, all verbs share the very same semantic feature: a movement of the hand. The verb *fu* in (5) means to tie something with ropes; *xifu* in (6), *fu* in (7) and *xi* in (8) 'to fasten something with ropes'; *bi* in (8) 'to keep someone in some place'; *toudao* in (9) 'to steal something away'; *nuo* in (10) 'to take something in hand'; *zhuo* in (11) 'to catch'; *zhizhuo* in (12) 'to hold in one's hand'. In all the examples (as noted) *jiangqu* is an action, 'take away', that also contains the semantic feature 'movement of the hand'.

However, by the eighth century this semantic constraint had dissipated. Henceforward, verbs could be freely used in this passive construction. With the exceptions of *qu* 取 'get something in hand' in (16) and *zhuo* 捉 'hold something in the hand' in (18), all the other verbs in the eighth century examples do not share the same semantic feature. In (13) and (14), *jie* means 'chop', an action that also involves 'movement of the arm'. The same can be said of *zhanjie* in (15), that can also be translated as 'chop'. Examples (17) and (19) are even more convincing of this semantic freedom. In (17), *cui* means 'blow'. As indicated by this character's right element *kou* 口 'mouth', the action 'blow' has nothing to do with the hand. In (19), *zhengshui* means 'levy tax'. The agent contained in (19) is a government. It is not even a human. The phrase *zhengshui* also has nothing to do with the hand.

---

8. Many of Yijing's works can be matched to the Sanskrit originals discovered in India and Central Asia. For more details about Yijing and his works, see Coblin (1991) and Wang (1996).

The third development that we need to discuss concerns the status of *jiangqu*. In some eighth century examples, *jiangqu*'s primary nature is very much less perceptible. Compared with earlier periods, *jiangqu* does not seem like a verb; rather, it seems meaning-less, if not completely lexically meaningless. Hardly does this unit code the action 'take/bring/move away from one location to another'. As suggested by the contexts of the examples, *jiangqu* appears to be a constituent which possesses the function value more than the lexical significance. In order to make this thesis clearer, we would like to see *jiangqu* as a semantically impoverished, functional element, and equate this SIFE with the English particle *away* attached to such verbs as *break, cast, drop, melt* and *wither*. Since *jiangqu* is no longer one of the core parts of a sentence, removing it neither damages the structural integrity, nor alters much of the meaning, nor impedes the reading.

Should *jiangqu* still be a verb, for instance, (18) would be redundant as indicated by this literal translation: "Cui Wenjian was arrested by Tibet and taken away. Tibet locked him up under extremely tight security." If we take *jiangqu* as a SIFE, however, the Chinese is much terser, as indicated by the English translation: "Cui Wenjian was taken away by Tibet. Tibet locked him up under extremely tight security." This concision-litany contrast, one may find, is related to the context, which tells us that Cui Wenjian was first captured and then imprisoned. Considering this specific chain of events (that 'Tibet locked him up under extremely tight security') embeds 'Cui Wenjian had already been *jiangqu* or taken away from one location to a new location where he was confined'. To stress the action (*jiangqu*) or the event (Cui Wenjian was taken away to a new place where he was finally jailed), therefore, sounds repetitious and monotonous. In other words, *jiangqu* is not a verb in (18).

The SIFE status of *jiangqu* appears to be clearer when we compare the fifth century AD examples with another eighth century occurrence, Example (19). As stated, *jiangqu* in the fifth century examples is a stacked verb. Since it is the core of a chunk, removing *jiangqu* hinders understanding. E.g., the aforementioned string, 縛將去殺 (*fu-jiangqu-sha* 'tie-take-away-kill'). Its new chunk 縛殺 (*fu-sha*) with *jiangqu* 'deprived' is less transparent and less straightforward in Chinese although its literal translation 'tie-kill' makes some sense in English. This new chunk *fu-sha*, as far as I know, has never been used in the Chinese language, whether ancient or modern. In contrast, the eighth century Example (19) can be deprived of *jiangqu*. In terms of both meaning and structure, this new string of (19), *bei Dashi zhengshui* (被大食徵稅), does not differ from the original string containing *jiangqu*, i.e. *bei Dashi zhengshui jiangqu* (被大食徵稅將去). The original context of (19) is clear and transparent. Its natural reading is that one Central Asian tributary state of the Tang dynasty was being relentlessly taxed by an advancing Arabic power. There seems to be no tantalizing clue to suggest its trea-

sure and people were being taken away (*jiangqu*) from their homeland to another location, which is presumably the Arabic kingdom. That is, *jiangqu* in (19) does not sound like a verb, and it does not mean 'take/bring/move away from one location to another'.

In a word, the eighth century witnesses a developmental leap in the use of {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*}. In particular, *jiangqu* undergoes significant changes, losing its primary verbal nature. The passive sequence of the examples, therefore, is not of the earlier {*bei* + verb₁ + verb₂} order. They can be categorized as a new *bei* passive sequence, the {*bei* + verb + SIFE} order, which contains a semantically impoverished functional element.

3.4   Further developments, ninth through eleventh centuries

Besides the two frequently quoted cases (1) and (2), I have only been able to find four new examples in three sources occurring between the ninth through eleventh centuries.

The first source, the *Shimen zijinglu* 釋門自鏡錄, contains one example (http://www.cbeta.org/result/normal/T51/2083_002.htm):

(20) 羊   即   被 牽   將去。
      yang ji   *bei qian jiangqu.*
      sheep immediately PM pull   away
                        BEI VERB SIFE
      'The sheep was immediately pulled away by (Lingcai Zhao).'

The second text, the *Xuansha Shibei chanshi guanglu* 玄沙師備禪師廣錄, has two cases in Roll 3 (http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/X73n1445_003).

(21) 被 他 善惡業果   拘   將去。
      bei ta   shan'e 'yeguo   ju   jiangqu.
      PM DEM good and bad karma restrain away
      BEI   AGENT   VERB SIFE
      '(You) are restrained by the good and bad karma.'

(22) 明朝   後日   盡 被 識情   帶   將去。
      mingzhao houri   jin bei shiqing dai   jiangqu.
      tomorrow the day after tomorrow all PM desire take   away
                              BEI AGENT VERB SIFE
      'Quickly, all will be taken away by early desires.'

The third source, the *Jingdechuandenglu* 景德傳燈錄, quotes (2) and (21) in Rolls 9 and 18 respectively. Its Roll 21 however contributes one new example (http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T51n2076_021):

(23) 恁麼　即　　被　生死　　拘　　將去　也。
     nenmo ji　　*bei　shengsi　ju　　jiangqu ye.*
     IM　　quickly PM　birth-death seize　away　FP
     　　　　　BEI AGENT　　VERB SIFE

     'Why should we be seized away by birth and death (as soon as birth and death
     approach us)?'

In terms of frequency, the {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} usage still remains fairly dormant
between the ninth and eleventh centuries. However, three observations can be
formulated.

First, the usage was spreading. The source, the *Shimen zijinglu*, is a biography
of monks composed by Huaixin 懷信 in Xi'an *c.* 810s AD. The *Xuansha Shibei
chanshi guanglu*, was republished in 1080. It is a collection of stories and catechet-
ical lectures given by Xuansha Shibei (835–908 AD), a Buddhist master from the
southeastern Chinese coastal city of Fuzhou 福州. The last document is one of the
primary sources for the history of Chan Buddhism in China. It was compiled by
Shi Daoyuan 釋道原 in the eastern Chinese city of Suzhou 苏州 in 1004. More-
over, I must here mention the sources that use (1) and (2) quoted at the begin-
ning of the present paper. Example (1) is from Dunhuang manuscript P.2653, in
which a swallow reasons with an invading bird to evacuate her nest. The man-
uscript is one later fragment of the *Yanzifu* 燕子賦, a rhymed work created not
before the early eighth century (Jian 1986; Yan 1998). Example (2) is found in
the above-mentioned Buddhist source, the *Zutangji*, dated in 952 from the south-
eastern coast of China. In contrast to the eighth century sources, most of which
were produced in the Tang heartlands, these post-eighth century sources are more
interesting because they were made and used over a wider area, one that stretched
from the Pacific coast of China to the Central Asian oases. In light of this vast geo-
graphical area, one can conclude that the {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} order was spread-
ing and was consequently being used by more people from the ninth century on.

The second important change is that the use was becoming complex. As illus-
trated by (2), (21), (22), and (23), the use from this period often inserted an agent
between the marker *bei* and the verb. Even more importantly, abstract concepts
could now also be used as the agent. Before the ninth century, the agent, whether
explicit or implicit, was either human, like the king in (16), or a concrete noun,
like the wind in (17). Not a single eighth century example contains an abstract,
inanimate concept as the agent. However, in the ninth century, the order did
begin to incorporate abstract nouns as agents. In (21), humans are restrained by
considerations of the reward and retribution that would be incurred by good or
bad deeds. In (22), humans are being led astray by earthly desires. In (23), the
agents are life and death. All these abstract concepts are personified and trans-
formed into agents that could initiate an action like humans do.

The third observation is related to *jiangqu*'s status. I must confess that criticisms have been leveled at me in private over the past few years, mostly complaint that the SIFE theory is tainted by individual impression, devoid of objectivity. Subjective and speculative as some arguments may be, a second glance over all the pre-twelfth century examples seem to shed further light on *jiangqu*'s nature and give some support to the SIFE hypothesis. Taken as a whole, these pre-twelfth century examples exhibit an interesting phenomenon: by the end of the seventh century, the serialization of three verbs cannot be attested. Before the eighth century, *jiangqu* could have been used in passive strings with three stacked verbs. For instance, in (5), (8), and (10), which are clear and undisputable, *jiangqu* either fills the second verbal slot or takes the third verbal slot. Since the eighth century onward, however, serialization of three verbs is nowhere to be found. Given this contrast, the disappearance of the three serial verbs – one may wonder – indicates that the nature of *jiangqu* has changed. Since it is no longer a verb, *jiangqu* is restricted to collocating more verbs, and it is not allowed to be used in passive strings as one of three stacked verbs. Admittedly, this observation, considering the small number of occurrences, can simply be dismissed as overinterpretation. From the eighth century down to the eleventh century, however, not a single passive string contains a third verb as shown. Q.E.D.

4.   Implications: Divide Chinese strings composed of a few characters

How to divide the Chinese strings containing a few characters, as already intimated, is an issue that is of great importance and yet has not been considered conscientiously within the literature on the Chinese passive. This section will revisit this issue by adding more theoretical reflections to the previous analysis of the concrete examples, with the aim of dismissing a few guidelines that have been commented on by other linguists as well.

4.1   The issue and the importance

The word *divide* in this context is not employed as a special technical term but as a common word with its basic sense. It means to 'slice' or 'segment' strings consisting of a few Chinese characters into smaller elements. The purpose of dividing, as indicated, is to analyze the interrelationship among constituents and determine the core structure underlying many cognates.

Or, to put it another way, the issue of dividing discussed in the present paper, for example, is how to separate the aforementioned examples into parts and expose the core structure of their *bei* passive. Take for instance this chunk in

Example (1), 奪將去 (*duo-jiang-qu*); *bei* will not be mentioned unless necessary. Although it contains only three simple characters, there are these four ways to split it: {*duo* + *jiang* + *qu*}, {*duojiang* + *qu*}, {*duo* + *jiangqu*} and {*duojiangqu*}. Respectively, should the core structure of all the similar *bei* examples be transcribed as follows?

> ①{*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*}, ②{*bei* + verb*jiang* + *qu*}, ③{*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*}, ④{*bei* + verb*jiangqu*} or ⑤{*bei*verb*jiangqu*}

That is, how to slice the strings like (1) is not at all easy, even though most of the characters arranged after *bei* are simple and common. The topic of division plays a critical role in correctly analyzing the examples. I shall elaborate on this importance with three points.

First, how to divide (1) and (2) remains almost undiscussed to date. In the literature, they are traditionally sliced into four elements and transcribed as {*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*}. This formula was first used by Cao (1990) and has been accepted ever since as the standard transcription. As far as I know, the only doubt cast over this common division is briefly offered by Feng. Regarding slicing (1), for instance, Feng (1992: 312) writes that "'*duo*/*jiangqu*'" (verb + *jiangqu*) is sensible and "'*duojiang*/*qu*'" (verb*jiang* + *qu*) "does also seem sensible", although he is "inclined to accept" the former formula. Despite his doubt, Feng also uses ①{*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*} on the same page, showing how popular the standard division is.

Secondly, strings are not the simple juxtaposition of isolated words. They are composed of words that are clustered together in order to generate meaning. Once words are misplaced, the local bonds of the clustered words are broken. Sequential organization is disrupted. Strings become hard to understand. That is, a string is a continuum of words that are interlaced such that the boundaries between words become pretty difficult to demarcate. Slicing these strung out words with distinct boundaries, therefore, is a precondition for any successful research that aims to deduce the common structure of many similar chunks.

Third, it must be observed that divisions reflect a researcher's scholarly stance and even his/her presuppositions. The standard division {verb + *jiang* + *qu*} reveals that the researcher believes that the string contains three elements, namely {verb, *jiang,* and *qu*}. Understandably, scholarly attention, as attested to by the literature, is just as much directed towards discussion of how the verb, *jiang*, and *qu* changed respectively. In contrast, my division {verb + *jiangqu*} is based on the assumption that the string is composed of two constituents, namely verb and *jiangqu*. As demonstrated by the above analysis, I focus on the development of the verb and *jiangqu*, ignoring the evolution of *jiang* and *qu* because their evolution

is only remotely relevant to my research. In other words, how to split a string can represent a danger in that the examples might be incorrectly analyzed.

In sum, the very act of dividing up a string could be viewed as a manipulation of the data in order to impact discussion, yet produce wrong results. The topic of division is an area that must be addressed before any general point is pressed.

4.2   How to divide the *bei* passive strings containing verb, *jiang*, and *qu*

Given all the arguments above, the *bei* passive string containing verb, *jiang* and *qu* can be sliced in these five ways: ①{*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*}, ②{*bei* + verb*jiang* + *qu*}, ③{*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*}, ④{*bei* + verb*jiangqu*} and ⑤{*bei*verb*jiangqu*}. As pointed out earlier, these five divisions are all possible. However, ③{*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} is the most acceptable.

Among the five divisions, the last one shall be rejected first. The reason is obvious. The Chinese passive is highlighted by passive markers. Such passive markers as *bei* are readily identified by Chinese grammatical rules. They should be recognized as discrete elements by linguists. That is to say, the transcription ⑤{*bei*verb*jiangqu*} fails to capture the very essence of the Chinese passive.

Compared with ⑤{*bei*verb*jiangqu*}, the division ④{*bei* + verb*jiangqu*} looks better because it separates *bei* from the other elements. However, it will be discarded as well. As illustrated by the analysis of (5), take the characters arranged after *bei* as one unit is also a simple practice. This practice mechanically mirrors the arrangement of the Chinese. It is not at all analytical. It does not expose the underlying structure, which is what a transcription is all about. As a matter of fact, this division remains in the realm of theory and has never been used by any researcher. It is designed by me because the discussion of (5) opens up the possibility of dividing the strings into ④{*bei* + verb*jiangqu*}.

The standard division ①{*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*}, as has been stated, should also be discarded. In addition to the above critique of the character-by-character practice, I would like to elaborate two more reasons. Reason One, this division was first suggested by Cao (1990: 132) on the basis of a single available example, namely (2). Understandably, he can neither delve into the linguistic uniqueness of (2) nor take into proper consideration how to slice its passive string. Reason Two, popularity does not guarantee that the standard formula is either acceptable or appropriate. The wide acceptance of ①{*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*}, as a matter of fact, is very much related to the rarity of the examples. As suggested in many places in the present paper, Examples (1) and (2) remain to date the only examples that have drawn the attention of mainstream scholarship. Given that the other examples are buried deep in the oceans of sources, scholars simply do not have the luxury of conducting in-depth analyses and reflect on Cao's original segment. Almost

all the recent researchers are forced to accept and thereby reproduce the earliest division, which is finally recognized as the sole, authoritative transcription. Nevertheless, the standard division is arbitrary. Its popularity is led to by the small amount of data, which has been passively accepted and uncritically transmitted.

Speaking of the remaining two divisions, ③{*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} is more credible than ②{*bei* + verb*jiang* + *qu*}. A syn/diachronic and para/syntagmatic examination reveals an interesting organizational similarity of all the examples; see Table 1.

Table 1. ③{*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} and ②{*bei* + verb*jiang* + *qu*} A syn/diachronic and para/syntagmatic analysis (fifth through twelfth centuries AD)

bei + <u>verb</u> + *jiangqu*	bei + <u>verbjiang</u> + *qu*
fu (縛, tie)	*fujiang* (縛將, tie-take)
nuo (搦, seize)	*nuojiang* (搦將, seize-take)
jie (截, cut)	*jiejiang* (截將, cut-take)
cui (吹, blow)	*cuijiang* (吹將, blow-take)

As indicated in Table 1, some elements, despite a generally evolving trend, remained unchanged throughout history and the only changing element has been the verb. When comparing examples from the same time period, one finds this structural pattern: the verb slot was filled by different verbs, but other slots by the same elements, i.e. *bei, jiang* and *qu*. When comparing examples from different time periods, one also finds an organizational pattern, which is exactly the same as the one above: the verb slot was taken by different verbs, whereas other slots were always occupied by the same elements, i.e. *bei, jiang*, and *qu*.

This recurrent pattern suggests that there is a stable core structure which contains a certain constraint. This constraint, as evidenced in Table 1, seems to work on the sequential plane of all the examples. It determines the arrangement of the Chinese characters. That is, the sequential constraint governs the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships of the constituents of the core structure, allowing the refilling of the verbal slot, while still preventing replacement of the other elements.

That is to say, the division ②{*bei* + verb*jiang* + *qu*} takes the verb and *jiang* as a single element, disrupting the natural arrangement of all the examples, but does not expose the un/stable parts of the core structure. By comparison, ③{*bei* + *verb* + *jiangqu*} explicitly and directly points to the structural similarity of all the cognates. It captures not only the underlying core structure but also the complicated interrelationship among the constituents shown in Table 1.

Therefore, not all the above-mentioned divisions are adequate. To separate the examples examined in this paper into three elements seems best. The division ③{*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} can be used to transcribe the examples examined in the present paper.

On the basis of the above summary, a few more words must be said about (1) and (2). First, their standard transcription ①{*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*}, due to the character-by-character division of strings, is too simplistic and must be rejected. Second, certain conclusions drawn from this division might be re-evaluated as well. According to many scholars, for instance, *jiang* is seen as a verb which codes the action 'take/bring'; *qu* is a deictic directional which specifies that the direction of *jiang* is MOVE AWAY from one location to another. One more example is this theory: *jiang* of (2) "is used as a marker that precedes the complement [*qu*] which indicates the direction of the movement" (Cao 1990: 132).[9] According to my analysis, however, this common practice of exploring the complex relationship amongst the usage's various constituents must be abandoned. The alleged interrelationship between *jiang* and *qu* probably does not exist in the specific context of (2) and the like because *jiangqu* is one single unit rather than two discrete elements.

4.3   Divide the active strings containing verb, *jiang* and *qu*

In the literature, the passive (1) and (2) are frequently discussed together with the active strings containing verb, *jiang*, and *qu*. The label "active" is used in contradistinction to "passive". Considering our critique of the divisions of the passive examples, exactly how to separate these active strings is likewise a worthwhile consideration.

These active strings including their divisions, one probably has already noticed, are also first examined in Cao's seminal paper published in 1990. According to that paper, these active examples contain three elements, namely verb, *jiang* and *qu*, and thus their core structure is {verb + *jiang* + *qu*}. The earliest examples examined by Cao (1990: 130) are {呼(*hu*) 將(*jiang*) 去 (*qu*)}, {捉(*zhuo*) 將(*jiang*) 去(*qu*)}, {曳(*ye*) 將(*jiang*) 去(*qu*)} and so on. They are excerpted from novelle, stories, and private writings made in the fourth and fifth centuries AD, demonstrating that the active strings appeared a little earlier than the passives, and that

---

9. This conclusion has been accepted by some scholars (Wu 1996: 329). Moreover, scholars including Cao (2014) also accept that *qu* in many other examples found in the medieval Chinese sources is a complement indicating the direction of the movement. This complement thesis will be challenged in § 4.3.

they were also more widely used – and number far more – than the passive occurrences.

The division {verb + *jiang* + qu}, needless to say, remains the standard transcription of the core structure of these active strings. During the past three decades or so, it has proven a great service to the field, offering a formula adopted by many scholars to delve into a unique use in the language of Chinese. Its influence cannot be overstated, as demonstrated by Wei (2013), who recently conducted a more comprehensive survey of the field.

However, despite its popularity, the division {verb + *jiang* + *qu*} seems questionable as well. In analogy to the observations about the passive examples, *jiang* and *qu* contained in some active strings can also be perceived as one constituent rather than two elements. This new transcription {verb + *jiangqu*} could be more reasonable and hence more eligible, although these active strings have not been scrutinized by the present paper due to its limited scope.

Nevertheless, it shall be helpful as well as fair to mention here that succinct doubts have already been cast over the standard division of the active strings. In his long paper, for instance, Wei (2013) basically endorses the common division, taking the {verb, *jiang* and *qu*} as three different elements. Meanwhile, Wei (2013: 877) also takes *jiang* and *qu* as a unit, explicitly noting that "*jiangqu*" codes "an action". His example is "*wo dang zhuoqu jiangqu* 我當捉取將去 ('I shall catch him and take him away')", a string quoted from a Buddhist *sūtra* translated in the early fifth century AD. The last four characters of this occurrence 捉取將去 (*zhuo qu jiang qu*), according to Wei, may not be sliced into three constituents although its division {*zhuoqu* + *jiang* + *qu*} is common and traditional. Rather, they should be analyzed as two elements that code "two actions", namely "*zhuoqu*" ('catch') and "*jiangqu*" ('take away') (Wei 2013: 877). In simple words, these four characters' accepted division {*zhuoqu* + *jiang* + *qu*} is wrong, and their proper formula is {*zhuoqu* + *jiangqu*}, which lends support to my observation above.

Considering these analyses, we also need to reevaluate certain conclusions derived from the conventional division of these active strings. The aforementioned traditional thesis that *qu* of these active examples is a complement, for instance, seems too general and can be questioned. In some examples, *jiang* and *qu* are not two discrete elements. They are lexicalized, producing one-unit *jiangqu*. This unit takes the function of a verb. It is not subject to further division.[10]

---

10. In analogy, some strings containing verb, *jiang* and *lai* 來 might also be sliced into {verb + *jianglai*} rather than the accepted transcription {verb + *jiang* + *lai*}. In the field, *lai* and *qu* are collectively recognized as the deictic directionals of which *lai* denotes the action 'come to' or 'move toward' (e.g. a speaker) whereas *qu* 'go to' or 'move away from' (e.g. a speaker), and the

4.4   Four guidelines for dividing the Chinese strings

Taken together, the comments above encourage us to make the following proposals to guide how to divide the Chinese strings.

1. The division topic merits due scholarly attention. Its importance must be recognized. It is an issue that has to be clarified before the general points are pressed. It must be realized that different divisions can produce different interpretations and even cause confusion.
2. Any division must be accurate. It will reflect historical use. A division can be neither imposed by scholarly inclination nor tailored for modern theories.
3. A division should be general. It must be based on the analysis of many examples. Ideally, it can be used to examine all the cognates not only of any given time period, but of different periods as well.
4. A division should be plain and yet not too simple. It must also be analytical enough. Not only can it delineate the core structure of the examples, but it can also reveal the interrelationship among the constituents.

4.5   The application scope of the observations

In order to avoid confusion or misdirection, a few more words must be said about the above observations' application scope.

First, the claims concerning the active/passive divisions grow out of a specific context, namely the examples dealt with by the mainstream. They apply only to a portion of the examples and their ilk. These proposals do not dictate that all the active/passive strings must be sliced in the way that the present paper does. In other words, this paper is not proposing that *jiang* and *qu* in all other active/ passive strings should be taken as a single element.

Likewise, to reevaluate the conclusions derived from the conventional divisions is also confined to specific contexts. It is not suggesting that all the common conclusions maintained by the mainstream have to be revisited. Again, it applies only to a certain percentage of occurrences; and as for this set, to offer a comprehensive list of these examples will undoubtedly help expand the readership. Yet it is a task that the present paper is unprepared to deal with.

But, despite the seemingly overcautious clarifications, a reanalysis of certain examples is an absolute desideratum. In addition to the examples examined herein, Wei's aforementioned example, 捉取將去 (*zhuo-qu-jiang-qu*), strongly discourages scholars from recognizing every instance of *jiang* and *qu* as two ele-

---

analysis of *lai* applies to *qu* or vice versa—for more detail, see Wei (2013). Yet the issue of *lai* falls out the scope of this paper. I shall deal with it in a separate paper.

ments. In this particular example, *jiangqu* is a single unit; *jiang* is not a marker; *qu* is not a complement; nor is *jiang* a complement marker. The interrelationship of these two characters is not as complex as is commonly believed.

5.   Conclusions

Despite the danger of overgeneralization due to a dearth of data, a few working conclusions can now be drawn up concerning several aspects of these pre-twelfth century Chinese strings containing {*bei*, verb, *jiang*, and *qu*}.

First of all, these strings are not the traditionally perceived constructions such as {verb + *jiang*} or {*bei* + verb + *jiang*}. They are unique in terms of structure. All share one core sequence according to syn/diachronic and para/syntagmatic analysis. Their core order will be transcribed as ③{*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*}. The common division ①{*bei* + verb + *jiang* + *qu*} seems wrong and must be abandoned. There is a need to revisit a series of conclusions derived from the accepted division for the past three decades or so.

Second, the issue of how to divide the Chinese strings cannot be overemphasized. Divisions can be pure theoretical speculation, having nothing to do with the actual historical use. Divisions may also be plagued by an inclination to presupposition, which can be overlooked by even the best minds. Anyhow, slicing the strings determines the interpretation of linguistic data and grammatical rules. It is an issue that needs to be clarified prior to the commencement of generalization. Divisions must be terse and analytical, capturing the core structure of all examples. We should start to devise a full set of procedures and principles that properly guide the work of division.

Third, the {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} use remains fairly dormant, hardly enjoying a meteoric rise between the fifth and the eleventh centuries. Despite the fact that changes do occur to aspects of the usage, the examples can only be found in a limited number of sources throughout the entire time period. Amongst these sources, most are Chinese Buddhist texts, religious as well as catechetical; a few are historical annals and literary works; but none can be taken as materials written in classical Chinese. Considering the dormancy and the limited range of source-genre, the usage is in an informal colloquial speech or *baihua* (白話) in Chinese rather than in formal standard Mandarin or *wenyan* (文言).

Fourth, the usage undergoes four stages of development before the twelfth century. The first stage corresponds to the fifth century when the earliest strings can be found. In this period, the use exclusively appears in Chinese Buddhist *sūtras*, and the examples are of the {*bei* + verb$_1$ + verb$_2$ (+verb$_3$)} order, of which the VERB$_2$ and/or VERB$_3$ slot is occupied by *jiangqu*. In the second stage, oth-

erwise known as the seventh century, the use expands into non-religious texts, and it starts to incorporate an agent, producing a complex order {*bei* + agent + verb$_1$ + verb$_2$}. The third stage, namely the eighth century, witnesses some leaps in use. The examples are used in sources made by authors from a vast territory. The non-human agent can be inserted. The principle of the same semantic domain constraining verbs dissipates. *Jiangqu* loses its verbal nature and retains a deictic function, becoming a non-essential, meaning-less function element. These examples, as argued, are to be taken as the {*bei* + verb + SIFE} order, in which the presence or absence of SIFE does not impinge on the integrity of the meaning or structure. The fourth stage extends from the ninth through the eleventh centuries during which time the use still remains limited, but keeps on evolving. The occurrences are employed in sources made from the Central Asian oasis to the Pacific coast, and an abstract, inanimate concept is for the first time used as the agent.

Fifth, the use in question raises a number of complicated questions. E.g., what are the factors that drive this use's evolution? Given the use's long dormancy, does high frequency of occurrence really make a word eligible for grammaticalization? Does frequency and language change correlate? How does the {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} use develop after the twelfth century? Among the examples traditionally recognized as {verb + *jiang* + *qu*}, how many of these examples should be perceived as {verb + *jiangqu*}? Given the divisions {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} as well as {verb + *jiangqu*}, shall we need to reexamine some pertinent prevailing conclusions about the medieval Chinese language? Can this reexamination generate new understandings? Can these new understandings enrich the discussion on the world's other languages?

Admittedly, the present paper itself also faces challenges. Due to the scarcity of examples, the picture of the use's pre-twelfth century evolution is sketchy, cursory, and unfinished, and the slow demotion of *jiangqu* from a verb to a semantically impoverished functional element is not a final conclusion, but a speculation that is subject to further scrutiny. At the current stage, however, what we can most confidently claim is the {*bei* + verb + *jiangqu*} use is a rare, unique, unproductive, and informal expression. Examples of this use should – and deserve to be – examined in their own right.

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

3P	third person pronoun	IM	interrogative marker
ADV.D	adverb of degree	NUM.CL	numeral classifier
ASPM	aspect marker	PM	passive marker
DEM	demonstrative pronoun	PREP	preposition
FP	final particle		

References

Bennett, Paul A. 1981. The evolution of passive and disposal sentences. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 9(1). 61–90.

Cao, Fengxia. 2014. *Hanyu beidong biaoji gengti lishi yanjiu*. Nanjing: Nanjing University Press.

Cao, Guangshun. 1990. The development of the "V + *jiang*" construction from the Wei, Jin, and Northern and Southern dynasties to the Song dynasty. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 1990(2). 130–135.

Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association. 1998. *The Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Corpus*. (http://www.cbeta.org/) (Accessed 2017-11-27.)

Coblin, W. South. 1991. A survey of Yijing's transcriptional corpus. *Yuyan Yanjiu* 1991(1). 68–92.

Feng, Chuntian. 1992. A preliminary analysis of some grammatical phenomenon in Tang and Five dynasties. In Cheng, Xiangqing (ed.), *Studies of Chinese language of the Sui, Tang and Five dynasties (581–960 A.D.)*, 269–326. Ji'nan: Shandong Education Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2016. The serial verb construction: Comparative concept and cross-linguistic generalizations. *Language and Linguistics* 17(3). 291–319.

He, Leshi. 1992a. Dunhuang bianwen yu *Shishuoxinyu* ruogan yufa tedian de bijiao. In Cheng, Xiangqing (ed), *Studies of Chinese language of the Sui, Tang and Five dynasties (581–960 A.D.)*, 133–268. Ji'nan: Shandong Education Press.

He, Leshi. 1992b. A study of the grammatical characteristics in Yuan drama – Through the comparison between the languages of the collection of 'Guan Hanqing's drama' and the collection of 'Dun Huang Bian Wen'. In Cheng, Xiangqing (ed), *Studies on the Chinese language, Song, Yuan and Ming dynasties period (960–1644 A.D.)*, 19–242. Ji'nan: Shandong Education Press.

Heine, Bernd & Claudi, Ulrike & Hünnemeyer, Friederike. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Jian, Tao. 1986. Textual researching the "Poem of Swallow" of Dunhuang MSS. *Dunhuang Yanjiu* 1986(3). 24–38.

Li, Chao. 2007. Evolution of the *bei* constructions in Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 35(1). 98–127.

Lin, Xinnian. 2006. *Zutangji de dongtai zhuci yanjiu*. Shanghai: SDX Joint Publishing Company.

Liu, Jian & Jiang, Lansheng & Bai, Weiguo & Cao, Guangshun. 1992. *Jindai Hanyu xuci yanjiu*. Beijing: Language & Culture Press.

Luo, Yaohua & Yao, Wenbiao. 2017. "V + zhi" jiegou de cihuihua ji xianguan wenti yanjiu. *Yuwen Yanjiu* 2017(1). 32–38.

Peyraube, Alain. 1989. History of the passive constructions in Chinese until the 10th century. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 17(2). 335–372.

Sun, Jianqiang. 2018. *Re-dating the seven early Chinese Christian manuscripts: Christians in Dunhuang before 1200*. Leiden: Leiden University. (Doctoral dissertation.)

Tang, Yuming. 1987. A brief survey of the passive construction in Chinese of the period from 206 B.C. to 589 A.D. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 1987(3). 216–222.

Tang, Yuming. 1988. Tang zhi Qing de "bei" ziju. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 1988(6). 459–468.

Tang, Yuming. 2002. *Zhuming zhongnian yuyanxuejia zixuanji: Tang Yuming juan*. Hefei: Anhui Educational Publishing House.

Tang, Yuming & Zhou, Xifu. 1985a. On the origin of the passive voice in Ancient Chinese. *Xueshu Yanjiu* 1985(5). 98–100.

Tang, Yuming & Zhou, Xifu. 1985b. The development of passive voice in Classical Chinese. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 1985(4). 281–285.

Wang, Bangwei. 1996. *Tang gaoseng Yijing shengping ji qi zhuzuo lunkao*. Chongqing: Chongqing Publishing Group.

Wang, Li. 2004[1957]. *Hanyu shigao*. Revised edn. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company. (First published in 1957 by Science Press.)

Wang, Li. 2005. *Hanyu yufa shi*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.

(Song) Wang, Qinruo. 1989. *Song ben 'Cefu yuangui'*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company. (4 vols., originally published in 1013.)

Wei, Pei-chuan. 2013. The particle *jiang* in early Mandarin Chinese. *Language and Linguistics* 14(5). 875–928.

Wu, Fuxiang. 1996. *'Dunhuang Bianwen' yufa yanjiu*. Changsha: Yuelu Press.

Wu, Zhenyu. 1991. "Dong + jiang + bu" jushi de lishi yanbian. *Jilin Daxue Shehui Kexue Xuebao* 1991(1). 86–90.

Xiao, Lirong. 2012. *Zhonggu shishu beidongju yanjiu*. Chengdu: Sichuan Normal University. (Master's thesis.)

Yan, Tingliang. 1998. Guanyu Yanzifu (jia) de xieben niandai wenti. *Bulletin of Beijing Library* 2. 102–107, 137.

Yuan, Bin. 2005. A passive sentence marked by "*meng*". *Yuyan Kexue* 4(6). 3–17.

Zhang, Cheng. 2002. *The historical evolution of the word-order of prepositional phrases in Chinese*. Beijing: Beijing Language and Culture University Press.

Zhang, Meilan. 2003. *'Zutangji' yufa yanjiu*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Zhang, Yanjun. 2010. *Hanyu beidongshi lishi yanjiu*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press.

Author's address

Jianqiang Sun
School of Humanities
Taizhou University
No. 1139, Shifu Road
Taizhou, Zhejiang 318000
China
2211408370@qq.com