1. Introduction

This paper proposes an analysis of pronoun cliticization across nonfinite clause boundaries in late archaic Chinese and which supports the movement analysis of control, proposed by Hornstein (1999) and subsequently developed by Hornstein (2001, 2003), Boeckx and Hornstein (2003, 2004, 2006), and others. The term late archaic Chinese refers roughly to the classical language of the Warring States period (5th-3rd centuries BCE). In what follows, I refer to this era as the classical period for simplicity.

The process of cliticization which I examine in this paper is fronting of object pronouns in the context of negation. Object pronouns in archaic Chinese were generally required to raise from VP and right-adjoin to a c-commanding negative element. In (1a), the reflexive raises and adjoins to the clausal negator bu. In (1b), the third-person object pronoun zhi attaches to the aspectual negator wei. In (1c), zhi attaches to the negative quantifier mo.

(1) a. 不患人之不己知。 (Analects 1)
Bu huan [ren zhi bu ji zhi ___].
not worry others GEN not self understand
‘Do not worry that others do not understand you.’

b. 驕而亡者，
[[Jiao er bu wang] zhe],
arrogant and not lose DET
未之有也。 (Zuozhuan, Ding 13)
wei zhi you ___ ye.
not.yet 3.OBJ exist DECL
‘There has not yet been one who is arrogant and does not lose everything.’
c. 吾先君亦莫之行也。 (Mencius 5)

Wu xian jun yi mo zhi xing ye.

I former lord also none 3.OBJ do DECL

‘None of our former lords did this either.’

Cliticization gradually declined during the classical period and was eventually lost from the spoken language by the end of the Han Dynasty (roughly 200BCE-200CE). This paper examines in detail clitic climbing from nonfinite embedded clauses, one construction in which a clear decline in cliticization can be observed during the classical period. In contrast to obligatory raising in earlier Chinese, failure to raise across a clause boundary becomes the norm from the middle of the classical period. There is one notable exception, however. When the matrix subject was the negative quantifier mo ‘none’, raising remains obligatory.

(2) 虎負嶮，莫之敢攫。

Hu fu yu, mo zhi gan [ying ___].
tiger back crevice none 3.OBJ dare approach

‘The tiger backed into a crevice and no one dared to approach it.’

What I propose in this paper is that cases involving mo ‘none’ are not exceptions if we assume Hornstein’s (1999, 2001) movement analysis of control. Under this analysis, the matrix subject mo ‘none’ is base merged in the embedded clause and subsequently moves to its surface position in the matrix clause. This allows cliticization to take place locally in the embedded clause before the subject raises. The appearance of clitic climbing is then simply the result of pied-piping the pronoun as the subject raises.

(3) 虎負嶮，莫之敢攫。

Hu fu yu, mo+zhi gan [<mo+zhi> ying ___].
tiger back crevice none+3.OBJ dare none+3.OBJ approach

‘The tiger backed into a crevice and no one dared to approach it.’
In this way, the movement analysis of control allows a principled account of why clitic climbing remains obligatory with *mo* ‘none’ throughout the classical period, in spite of the clear trend toward clause-boundness with other negators during the classical period. Section 2 provides a survey of the shift in the empirical pattern, concluding that clitic climbing from embedded clauses was essentially lost in the mid-classical period. In section 3, I examine the syntactic behavior of the negative quantifier *mo*, which induces raising in examples like (2), and propose that it should be analyzed as occupying subject position. As the subject argument, *mo* is base merged as the external argument in the embedded clause in a control construction. If there is a pronoun in the embedded VP, *mo* will trigger cliticization in the embedded clause and then pied-pipe the clitic when it raises to matrix subject position. Section 4 considers the question of raising-to-object in classical Chinese, which presents a potential counterexample for the raising analysis of control. I show, however, that the construction in question is not a control construction and therefore not a counterexample to the raising analysis. Section 5 dismisses another potential counterexample. The negator *fu*, which has been argued in the literature to be a fusion of the negator *bu* ‘not’ and a raised 3rd person object pronoun *zhi*, can be used to negate the matrix verb in a control construction, suggesting that the pronoun *zhi* has climbed out of the embedded clause. However, I argue in this section that *fu* was not, in fact, fused with *zhi* but rather with a causative *v* and therefore is not a counterexample to the claim that cliticization was clause-bound from the mid-classical period.

2. Positions for Object Pronouns in Subject Control Contexts

This section summarizes the data involving clitic climbing or the lack thereof in the classical period. If the data are taken in aggregate, it is difficult to identify a coherent pattern, as I show in section 2.1. Pronouns generally did not raise when the matrix negator was *bu* ‘not’. However, there are also examples of raising involving all three of the negators discussed in section 1, including one example with *bu* ‘not’.

In order to make sense of this apparent optionality, in section 2.2, I divide the data diachronically and also according to matrix negator. Two results are obtained from this categorization. First, we can observe an overall decline in the occurrence of clitic climbing from
the early to the mid classical period. Secondly, nearly all instances of clitic climbing from the mid classical period will be shown to occur when the matrix negator is *mo* ‘none’.

2.1. A Mixed Picture

Numerous examples can be found in the classical period of pronouns remaining in embedded clauses and not raising to attach to a negator in the matrix clause. The matrix negator in most of these examples is *bu* ‘not’. The matrix verbs include *yu* ‘want’, *gan* ‘dare’, *wang* ‘go’, etc. We can also observe different pronouns. *Zhi* ‘3.Obj’ and *wo* ‘me’ appear in the examples below.

(4)  a. 吾不欲觀之矣。  
(Wu bu yu [guan zhi] yi.  
*I no longer wish to see this.*

b. 而子不欲我見伊尹。  
(ER zi bu yu [wo jian Yiyin].  
‘But you don’t want me to see Yiyin.’

c. 爲人臣者，不敢去之。  
(Wei ren chen zhe bu gan [qu zhi].  
‘One who serves as someone’s minister does not dare to leave him.’

d. 君欲見之，召之，  
(Jun yu jian zhi, zhaoy zhi,  
*lord want see 3.OBJ summon 3.OBJ*  
則不往見之。  
(ze bu wang [jian zhi].  
‘If the lord wants to see him, he calls him. But (he) does not go to see him (the lord).’
It is even more difficult to discern a pattern when considering the cases involving pronoun raising. All types of negation in the matrix clause can be seen to trigger raising, even *bu* ‘not’ in (5d). There is also overlap in matrix verbs, the first two examples in (5) involving *gan* ‘dare’. The pronoun itself also does not seem to influence whether raising takes place, as we observe the same set of pronouns as seen in (4). In particular, note that raising of *zhi* ‘3.Obj’ takes place over the matrix verb *gan* ‘dare’ in (5a). This pronoun did not raise over *gan* ‘dare’ in (4c).

(5)  

a. 虎 負 崖， 莫 之 敢 攏。  (Mencius 14)  

Hu fu yu, mo zhi gan [ying __].  

tiger back crevice none 3.OBJ dare approach  

‘The tiger backed into a crevice and no one dared to approach it.’

b. 如 火 烈烈， 則 莫 我 敢 遏。  (Xunzi 15)  

Ru huo lielie ze mo wo gan [e __].  

like fire fierce then none us dare block  

‘If (we) are fierce as fire, then no one will dare to challenge us.’

c. 子路 有 聞， 未 之 能 行，  (Analects 5)  

Zilu you wen, wei zhi neng [xing __].  

Zilu have hear not.yet 3.OBJ can execute  

唯 恐 有 聞。  

wei kong you wen  

only fear have hear  

‘When Zilu has heard (something), before he can execute it, he only fears hearing (something else).’

d. 余 不 女 忍 殺。  (Zuozhuan, Zhao 1)  

Yu bu ru ren [sha __].  

I not you endure kill  

‘I cannot bear to kill you.’
In sum, we can easily find both examples of clitic climbing and examples of pronouns remaining in embedded clauses during the classical period. The distinction between raising and non-raising cases also does not seem to be determined solely on the basis of matrix negator, type of pronoun, or embedding verb.

2.2. Breakdown of the Data

The goal of this subsection is a systematic characterization of the data presented in the previous subsection. Two patterns emerge if we divide the data first diachronically and then on the basis of matrix negator. Specifically, we can observe a clear decline in clitic climbing over time. Secondly, the remaining cases of climbing in the later stage of development nearly all involve the negator \textit{mo} ‘none’.

I performed searches in the Academia Sinica Classical Chinese electronic database for the following combinations of negators, pronouns, and matrix verbs. The negators considered are the three exemplified in the preceding examples. One negator \textit{弗} \textit{fu}, which is analyzed by Ding (1933), Wei (1999), and others as the fusion of \textit{bu} ‘not’ and the object pronoun \textit{zhi}, was not included in the counting. I present the data involving \textit{fu} in section 5, together with an analysis which asserts that the appearance of \textit{fu} is not a reflection of pronoun raising and therefore not a counterexample to the claim in this paper.

The pronouns considered are not an exhaustive set of pronouns found in the texts of the classical period but were chosen on the basis of whether they occur in a combination of raising and non-raising contexts. It should be noted that three separate first person pronouns appear in the list below. The examples involving \textit{yu} are found only in the earlier texts. \textit{Wu} occurs primarily in the later texts. \textit{Wo} is found throughout the classical period. Its functional characteristics are difficult to state clearly, but it occurs frequently in contrastive or emphatic contexts.

A variety of embedding verbs are included in the survey. The most frequently occurring ones are the ones listed below.
First, I compare the occurrences of raising diachronically. I contrast texts of the pre- and early classical period until the 5th century BCE with texts from the mid-classical period. In so doing, we find that raising was more common in the earlier period, as shown in (7a), than in the later period, as can be seen in (7b).

\[(7) \quad \text{a.} \quad \text{子路有闻，未之能行，} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Zilu} & \quad \text{have hear not.yet} \quad 3.\text{OBJ can execute} \\
\text{唯恐有闻。} & \\
\text{only fear have hear} \\
\text{‘When Zilu has heard (something), before he can execute it, he only fears hearing} \\
\text{something else.’}\
\end{align*}
\]

\[(7) \quad \text{b.} \quad \text{为人臣者，不敢去之。} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Wei} & \quad \text{be person minister DET not dare leave 3.OBJ} \\
\text{‘One who serves as someone’s minister does not dare to leave him.’}\
\end{align*}
\]

In the earlier texts, raising appears to be essentially obligatory. Only in the Analects of Confucius do we find a roughly even balance between raising and non-raising cases. The increase in the ratio of non-raising cases may be a reflection of the historical change to clause-bounded cliticization. A contributing factor is the fact that cliticization was blocked in both
periods when the pronoun was contained in a PP, as I discuss at the end of this section. There is one such example in the *Analects*.

(8) Books (up to 5th C. BCE)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Raising</th>
<th>No Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of Songs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuo zhuan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raising remains prevalent in the later period, but the ratio has decreased from more than 6-to-1 to less than 2-to-1. Clearly, then, we observe an overall decline in raising over time.

(9) Books (4th – 2nd C. BCE)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Raising</th>
<th>No Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mencius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuang zi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laozi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangjun Shu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanzi Chun qiu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xunzi</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanfeizi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lüshi Chun qiu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, I add a second dimension to the comparison. The negative quantifier *mo* ‘none’ generally triggered raising in both the earlier and later periods, as shown in (10a). In contrast to this, we observe a drastic decrease in the later period in raising when other negators appear in the matrix clause, as repeated in (10b).
(10) a. 虎負嵎，莫之敢攫。
   (Mencius 14)
   Hu fu yu, mo zhi gan [ying __].
   tiger back crevice none 3.OBJ dare approach
   ‘The tiger backed into a crevice and no one dared to approach it.’

b. 爲人臣者，不敢去之。
   (Zhuangzi 20)
   Wei ren chen zhe bu gan [qu zhi].
   be person minister DET not dare leave 3.OBJ
   ‘One who serves as someone’s minister does not dare to leave him.’

The difference between the earlier and later periods is in the ratio of raising examples involving mo ‘none’. In the earlier texts, raising with mo and raising with another negator are roughly equal in frequency. In the later texts, however, raising nearly always involves mo. There are only two examples of raising with a different negator.

(11) Books (up to 5th C. BCE) | Raising with 莫 mo | Raising with other negator
--- | --- | ---
Iching | 0 | 1
Book of Songs | 8 | 3
Chunqiu Zuozhuan | 3 | 7
Analects | 0 | 2
11 | 13
It is reasonable to ask at this point whether raising was obligatory with 莫  mo ‘none’. In other words, are there examples with mo which lack raising? (13) shows that there were a handful of examples.

(13) Lack of raising with 莫 mo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Books (up to 5th C. BCE)</th>
<th>Books (4th–2nd C. BCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mencius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuangzi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laozi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangjun Shu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanzi Chunqiu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xunzi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanfeizi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lüshi Chunqiu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the five exceptions in the later texts, the pronouns are all contained within PPs, as in (14).

(14) 天下 莫 能 與 之 爭。 (Laozi 22)

Tianxia mo neng [[yu zhi] zheng].

world none can with 3.OBJ fight

‘Noone in the world can fight with it.’

Interestingly, cliticization never took place from a PP. This is true not only of biclausal cases like (14), but even of monoclausal contexts like (15). Therefore, we can conclude that there
were no exceptions to the obligatoriness of raising with \textit{mo} ‘none’ in the later classical period and only one exception in the earlier period\textsuperscript{iii}.

(15) a. 齊人莫如我敬王。 \textit{(Mencius 4)}

Qi ren mo [ru wo] jing wang.

Qi person none like me respect king

‘Of the people of Qi, none respect the king as I do.’

b. 可與言而不與之言，失人。

Ke yu yan er bu [yu zhi] yan shi ren.

POT with speak CONJ not with 3.OBJ speak lose person

‘If you do not speak with a person with whom you could speak, then you lose the person.’ \textit{(Analects 15)}

To summarize this section, we have seen that raising declines overall during the classical period. However, raising does continue to occur with \textit{mo} ‘none’. In the next section, I discuss the characteristics of \textit{mo} and present an analysis of raising with \textit{mo} which accounts for this discrepancy.

3. Analysis of Raising with \textit{mo} ‘none’

Section 3.1 first proposes an analysis of \textit{mo} ‘none’ as a quantifier merged in argument position, typically subject position. In section 3.2, I propose an analysis of clitic climbing with \textit{mo} based on the movement analysis of control of Hornstein (1999, 2001). This approach to nonfinite embedded clause structure allows clitic climbing in the later classical period to be viewed as clause-bound across the board. Examples involving cliticization to \textit{mo} need not be treated as an exception to this constraint, since \textit{mo} will be base-merged in the embedded clause, allowing cliticization to take place locally in the downstairs domain before \textit{mo} moves to the matrix subject position, pied-piping the pronoun with it.
3.1. Characteristics of mo ‘none’

This subsection discusses the syntactic characteristics of mo ‘none’ and shows that they are consistent with the proposal that mo occupies subject position. In (16a), mo ‘none’ appears by itself as the subject. (16b) further shows that mo can be preceded by other material, specifically an object topic and a locative adjunct, but it still quantifies only over the subject. Note that the topic is resumed by the oblique pronoun yan in the VP. Object topics in Chinese during this period were base-generated in the left periphery and obligatorily resumed by pronouns in argument position.

(16) a. 君仁莫不仁。(Mencius 7)
Jun ren, mo bu ren.
ruler benevolent none not benevolent
‘If the ruler is benevolent, then none is not benevolent.’

b. 晉國天下莫強焉。(Mencius 1)
Jin Guo Tianxia mo qiang yan.
Jin nation world none strong 3.DAT
‘The Jin nation, in the world, none is stronger than them.’

A referential subject could occur in topic position preceding mo ‘none’, as in (17).

(17) a. 上好禮，則民莫敢不敬。
Shang hao Li, ze min mo gan bu jing.
above observe Rites then people none dare not respect
‘If those in high office observe the Rites, then none of the people will dare to not be respectful.’

b. 人主莫不欲其臣之忠。
Renzhu mo bu yu qi chen zhi zhong.
ruler none not desire 3.GEN vassal Gen loyalty
‘No ruler does not desire the loyalty of his vassals.’
That the preceding NP is in topic position, while *mo* ‘none’ occupies subject position, is demonstrated by examples like the following, in which the adverb *yi* ‘also’ intervenes between the topic and *mo*.

(18) a. 吾 先 君 亦 莫 之 行 也。 (*Mencius* 5)
   Wu xian jun yi mo zhi xing __ ye.
   1 former lord also none 3.OBJ do DECL
   ‘None of our former lords did this either.’

   b. 山 川 鬼 神, 亦 莫 敢 不 寧。 (*Mozi* 31)
   Shan chuan gui shen, yi mo gan bu ning.
   mountain river ghost god also none dare not peaceful
   ‘No ghost or god of the mountains or rivers also does not dare to not be peaceful.’

In the examples in (19), *mo* ‘none’ also occurs with one or more topics but still quantifies only over the subject. (19b) is particularly interesting in this regard. *Mo* is contained in a nominalized embedded clause. Complements of verbs of perception in this period were typically nominalized, as evidenced by the fact that the clause-initial nominal constituent, an object topic in (19b), is followed by the genitive case marker. *Mo* stands alone as the subject, following the genitive marker *zhi*. The second occurrence of *zhi* is the resumptive pronoun referring to the topic.

(19) a. 之 人 也, 物 莫 之 傷。 (*Zhuangzi* 1.1)
   Zhi ren ye, wu mo zhi shang.
   DEM person TOP thing none 3.OBJ harm
   ‘This person, no thing can harm him.’

   b. 知 道 之 莫 之 若 也 ...。 (*Xunzi* 22)
   Zhi [dao zhi mo zhi ruo] ye
   know Way Gen none 3.OBJ equal COND
   ‘If (one) knows that nothing is equal to the Way....’
This contrasts strikingly with modern Mandarin *dou* ‘all’, which Cheng (1991) analyzes as an adverb adjoined to a verbal or aspectual projection and quantifying over constituents to its left. When an object is topicalized, *dou* is able to quantify over either the subject or the fronted topic.

**Modern Mandarin** (Cheng 1991:162)

(20) nei-xie-shu women *dou* kan-guo

that-CL-book we all read-ASP

‘All of those books, we have read.’ or ‘We all have read those books.’

It is unlikely, however, that *mo* is an adverb quantifying over a c-commanding subject or topic DP, given that, even when it is preceded by a topic, it only quantifies over the subject, as in (16b) and (19a&b). (16a) is also illuminating, as it is uttered at the beginning of the discourse. If we analyzed *mo* as an adverb, it would be necessary to posit *pro* to check the EPP and case features of T. But given that there has been no referent introduced for a *pro* subject in (16a), we must conclude that *mo* itself functions as the subject.

(21) offers additional examples with some preceding discourse. The first line in (21a) discusses only the kings and how they ruled in antiquity. No referent is introduced which could be construed with *mo* in the second line. Likewise, the preceding discourse in (21b) asserts the nonexistence of one type of person, *junzi* ‘gentleman’, so this NP cannot be construed as the topic quantified over by *mo*.

(21) a. 行仁政而王，

*Xing ren zheng er wang,*

*institute benevolent government CONJ rule*

莫之能禦也。

*mo zhi neng yu ye.*

*none 3.OBJ can obstruct DECL*

‘As (they) ruled by benevolence, noone could stand against them.'
b. 無 君子， 莫 治 野 人。  (Mencius 5)

Wu junzi, mo zhi ye ren.

not.exist gentleman none govern wild person

‘If there were no gentlemen, then noone would rule the barbarians.’

The preceding characteristics of mo ‘none’ receive a straightforward account if mo is analyzed as the subject argument. However, this proposal suggests that mo might be able to occur in any argument position, including a VP-internal one. This prediction is not borne out. On the other hand, this fact is not necessarily a counterexample to the analysis proposed here for mo, because it can be accounted for by a general ban on quantificational material in VP. As discussed by Aldridge (2006), quantifiers were prohibited from appearing in the VP in classical Chinese. In order to quantify over an object, for example, a quantificational adverb or verb appeared to the left of VP and quantified over VP-internal arguments or the event as a whole. Therefore, the fact that mo never appears VP-internally is simply one instance of the more general ban on quantificational material in the VP.

(22) a. 不 畢 收 則 不 畢 御。

Bu jin [VP shou pro] ze bu jin [VP yu pro].

not all harvest then not all use

‘If (the grain) is not all harvested, then it cannot all be used.’ (Mozi, Qihuan)

b. 不 如 多 與 之 邑。

Buru duo [VP yu zhi yi].

be.better much give 3.OBJ city

‘It would be better to give them more cities.’ (Zuo zhuan, Cheng 2)

This does not mean that mo ‘none’ could not be base merged as an internal argument. This was, of course, possible, so long as it vacated the VP during the course of the derivation. This happens, for example, in the case of passivization. (23) shows examples of passive potential constructions formed on ke. Mo ‘none’ is the internal argument subject in both of these examples.
(23) a. 若吾子之德, 莫可歌也,
Ruo [wu zi zhi de], mo ke ge ye,
if my sir GEN virtue none PASS sing.praise COND

其誰來之?
qi shei lai zhi?
then who come 3.OBJ

‘My good sir, given your virtues, if none could be praised in song, then who would come (because of these virtues)?’

b. 父母、學、君三者,
Fumu, xue, jun san zhe,
parents scholarship ruler three DET

莫可以為治法。
mo ke yi wei zhi fa.
none PASS take be govern law

‘Parents, scholarship, rulers: among these three, none can be taken to be governing laws.’

A parallel situation can be observed with other quantified objects. There was one determiner type strong quantifier in classical Chinese, mei ‘each/every’. If mei combined with an object, then the entire constituent had to vacate the VP, as the fronting in (24) shows.

(24) 子入大廟，每事問。
Zi ru da miao, [mei shi] wen ___.
master enter great temple every matter ask

‘When the master enters the great temple, he asks about every matter.’

3.2. Cliticization and Control

To return to the question of clitic climbing, in section 2.2, I concluded that cliticization was generally clause-bound by the mid-classical period. (25a) shows a pronoun remaining in situ in
the embedded VP and not raising into the matrix clause to attach to the matrix negator *bu* ‘not’. The only exception to this generalization was when the matrix negator was *mo* ‘none’. In this case, we saw in section 2.2 that raising was obligatory, as repeated in (25b).

(25) a. 为 人 臣 者，不 敢 去 之。 (Zhuangzi 20)
   Wei ren chen zhe bu gan [qu zhi].
   be person minister DET not dare leave 3.OBJ
   ‘One who serves as someone’s minister does not dare to leave him.’

b. 虎 负 嵖， 莫 之 敢 接。 (Mencius 14)
   Hu fu yu, mo zhi gan [ying ___].
   tiger back crevice none 3.OBJ dare approach
   ‘The tiger backed into a crevice and no one dared to approach it.’

The proposal that *mo* ‘none’ occupies subject position has a welcome consequence for the analysis of this asymmetry. This analysis of *mo*, together with the movement analysis of control proposed by Hornstein (1999, 2001, 2003), Boeckx and Hornstein (2003, 2004, 2006), Bowers (2008), and others, allows clitic climbing with *mo* to be analyzed as local cliticization and need not be viewed as an exception to the general loss of clitic climbing in the mid-classical period. In contrast, Chomsky’s (1981) Government and Binding Theory approach to control does not offer an obvious principled account of why cliticization takes place only when the matrix negator is *mo*.

To first review the approach to subject control in the Government and Binding theory, the Case Filter and θ-Criterion required that each nominal argument have exactly one case and one θ-role. Biclausal structures like (26) have a matrix subject which appears to be thematically related to the embedded subject position. The embedded clause is also nonfinite, meaning that nominative case is unavailable for the embedded subject. If the matrix subject ‘John’ were base-generated in the embedded clause and moved to [Spec, IP] in the matrix clause, then that chain would have only one case, i.e. the nominative case assigned by matrix Infl, satisfying the Case Filter. However, this NP would receive two θ-roles, one from the embedded predicate and another from the matrix predicate. Therefore, movement of ‘John’ from the embedded clause to the matrix clause would result in a violation of the θ-Criterion. To circumvent this problem, a
null element PRO is posited to occupy nonfinite subject position. PRO does not require case; in fact, PRO cannot appear in a case-marked position. The thematic relation between the embedded and matrix subjects is established through coindexation (control).

(26) John\textsubscript{i} hopes \([CP [IP \text{PRO}\textsubscript{i} to leave]]\).

In contrast to the government/binding-based analysis involving PRO, Hornstein (1999, 2001) proposes the following alternative, in which the embedded subject is the trace of the moved matrix subject. A key theoretical difference between the two approaches is certain assumptions regarding \(\theta\)-roles. The movement approach treats \(\theta\)-roles as features on verbs; \(\theta\)-roles are assumed by arguments at the time the argument checks this feature with a verb. Another key assumption of the movement approach is that there is no upper limit on the number of \(\theta\)-roles an argument can have. This second assumption is crucial in that the movement analysis of control requires movement from a \(\theta\)-position to another \(\theta\)-position.

This derivation is shown in (27), where the matrix subject is base-generated as the external argument of the embedded verb ‘leave’. It checks the \(\theta\)-role of this verb and subsequently moves to [Spec, IP] to satisfy the EPP requirement of the embedded clause. Since nonfinite Infl is unable to satisfy the case feature of the DP, however, ‘John’ must continue to move. Landing in the specifier of matrix VP, it checks the external \(\theta\)-role of the matrix verb ‘hope’, thereby assuming its second \(\theta\)-role. Finally, ‘John’ moves to subject position in the matrix clause, where its case feature can be checked, thereby allowing the derivation to converge.

(27) John \([VP <John> \text{hopes } [IP <John> to [IP <John> leave]]]]\)

Much of the theoretical decision between the two approaches centers on the choice of allowing a single NP to acquire multiple \(\theta\)-roles, as in the raising approach, or in requiring the existence of the grammatical formative PRO whose distribution is limited to subject position in nonfinite clauses. The purpose of this paper is to make a purely empirical contribution to this debate: clitic climbing in mid-to-late classical Chinese constitutes empirical support for the movement analysis in (27). Recall first the conclusion of section 2.2 that cliticization was generally clause bound by the mid-classical period except when the matrix subject was \textit{mo}.
What I propose here is that the movement approach to control allows clitic climbing (and the lack thereof) from the mid-classical period to receive a principled analysis, while the PRO approach does not offer an obvious way to predict when raising does and does not occur.

On the movement analysis of control, when the matrix subject is *mo* ‘none’, as in (28a), it is base merged in subject position in the embedded clause. This triggers cliticization in the embedded domain. When *mo* ‘none’ moves to the matrix subject position, it pied-pipes the pronoun with it. The lack of clitic climbing with another matrix negator is also accounted for, since there is no negation in the embedded clause. Therefore, the pronoun remains in its base position.

(28) a. 虎負嵎，莫之敢撄。
Hu fu yu, mo=zhí gan [<mo=zhí> ying ___].
tiger back crevice none+3.OBJ dare none+3.OBJ approach
‘The tiger backed into a crevice and no one dared to approach it.’ (*Mencius* 14)

b. 為人臣者，不敢去之。
[Wei ren chen zhe], bu gan [ti qu zhí].
be person minister DET not dare leave 3.OBJ
‘One who serves as someone’s minister does not dare to leave him.’

(*Zhuangzi* 20)

If, on the other hand, we were to assume the PRO account of obligatory subject control, cases of clitic climbing with *mo* ‘none’ would have to be treated as exceptions. In other words, cliticization across a clause boundary would either have to be treated as optional or stipulated as obligatory with *mo* ‘none’ but not with other negators.

(29) a. 為人臣者，不敢去之。
Wei ren chen zhe bu gan [PRO qu zhí].
be person minister DET not dare leave 3.OBJ
‘One who serves as someone’s minister does not dare to leave him.’

(*Zhuangzi* 20)
b. 虎負嵎，莫之敢攖。 (Mencius 14)
Hu fu yu, mo zhi gan [PRO ying ___].
tiger back crevice none 3.OBJ dare approach
‘The tiger backed into a crevice and no one dared to approach it.’

In this way, the movement approach to control allows a principled account of citic climbing when the matrix subject was mo. This in turn allows cliticization from the mid-classical period to be viewed as generally clause-bound, a constraint which was one step in the historical change which eventually led to the ultimate loss of cliticization in early middle Chinese.

As a final note, I point out that an alternative analysis based on restructuring (in the sense of Wurmbrand 2001) would also not account for the contrast in (28a&b). Claiming that the complement of the higher verb gan ‘dare’ is VP rather than TP would allow pronoun raising in (30a) to be viewed as clause bound. However, the lack of raising in (30b) would then not be straightforwardly accounted for, since the intervening VP boundary would not be expected to block raising.

(30) a. 虎負嵎，莫之敢攖。 (Mencius 14)
Hu fu yu, mo zhi gan [VP ying ___].
tiger back crevice none 3.OBJ dare approach
‘The tiger backed into a crevice and no one dared to approach it.’

b. 爲 人臣者，不敢去之。
Wei ren chen zhe bu gan [VP qu zhi].
be person minister DET not dare leave 3.OBJ
‘One who serves as someone’s minister does not dare to leave him.’
(Zhuangzi 20)

4. Raising to Object?

Hornstein (1999, 2001), Boeckx and Hornstein (2004, 2006), and Bowers (2008) have proposed that object control constructions like (31a) are also derived through raising, as in (31b). The
matrix object ‘Harry’ is merged as the subject of the embedded clause. It receives its first \( \theta \)-role from the embedded verb ‘leave’. This DP then raises to the embedded [Spec, IP] to satisfy the EPP requirement in the embedded clause. Finally, this DP raises to object position in the matrix VP and receives a second \( \theta \)-role from that verb ‘persuade’.

(31) a. John persuaded Harry to leave.
   b. ‘[IP John [\( \textit{vP} \) <John> persuaded [VP Harry <persuaded> [IP <Harry> to [\( \textit{vP} \) <Harry> leave]]]]]

This leads to a relevant prediction regarding the analysis of classical Chinese put forth in this paper. We expect the embedded subject in an object control construction to raise into the matrix VP. If this argument is a pronoun and if the matrix clause contains a negator, we further expect the pronoun to cliticize to this negator, since cliticization from the matrix VP would be local cliticization and therefore conform to the generalization put forth in this paper.

I have found one construction where this prediction can be tested. The embedding verb is the causative verb \textit{shi}. The embedded clause is nonfinite, as expected, and the embedded subject receives accusative case from matrix \( \textit{v} \).

(32) 上 賢 使 之 爲 三公。 \hspace{1cm} (\textit{Xunzi} 12)
Shang xian shi \textit{zhi}[\textit{Acc}] wei sangong.
most able make 3.OBJ be sangong
‘The most capable, make them into \textit{sangong} (the highest official rank).’

To return to the prediction sketched above, this construction at first blush seems to constitute a counterexample to the movement analysis of control. As (33) shows, pronouns did not cliticize out of the complement of \textit{shi}. This is unexpected, if we analyze (33) as involving raising of the embedded subject pronoun into the matrix VP.
What I argue here, however, is that this construction does not involve control and therefore does not constitute a counterexample to the raising analysis of control. First, let me point out some well-known argument structure asymmetries between object control constructions and what is traditionally analyzed as exceptional case-marking (ECM), in which the embedded subject remains in embedded subject position and receives its case ‘exceptionally’ from the matrix verb or v.

First, ECM structures are compatible with embedded pleonastic subjects, as in (34), indicating that the matrix verb does not assign a θ-role to this argument.

(34) I expected [TP there to be a ceremony].

In contrast, object control verbs have a direct thematic relation with the matrix object. Thus, this position is incompatible with pleonastic elements, as shown in (35b).

(35) a. I persuaded Mary to come.
   b. *I persuaded there to come.

Indirect evidence for the lack of a thematic relation between the matrix verb and the embedded subject in ECM constructions comes from the fact that passivization can take place in the embedded clause, as in (36b), without significantly altering the meaning.

(36) a. I expected [TP her to give out medals].
   b. I expected [TP her to be given a medal].

This again contrasts with object control, in which passivization in the embedded clause is much more restricted.
Finally, the thematic relation between the control verb and the matrix object mirrors that between the same verb and its object in a monoclausal construction.

This again contrasts with the ECM type. In the biclausal example in (39b), the matrix verb clearly selects the entire embedded proposition and does not have a direct thematic relation with the embedded subject which is identical to that in the monoclausal example.

Returning to classical Chinese, causative constructions involving embedding under *shi* pattern with ECM and not with control. First, in addition to selecting a clausal complement, the causative verb *shi* could select an object in monoclausal constructions. In these cases, *shi* was commonly used to mean ‘use’ or ‘employ’, as in (40a). This meaning is not retained in the biclausal construction, as in (40b). This contrasts clearly with object control constructions in English, in which the semantic relation between the matrix verb and object controller does not change significantly from monoclausal to biclausal use.
Passivization could also freely take place in the embedded complement of *shi* ‘make’.

(41) 何 能 使 五穀 常 收，
Qi neng shi wugu chang shou
how can make grain always harvest
而 旱 水 不 至 哉？
er han shui bu zhi zai?
CONJ drought flood not arrive EXCL
‘How could (one) make grain always be harvested but drought and flood not arrive?’

Given that classical Chinese causative constructions pattern with ECM and not object control constructions, I propose that the embedded subject is located in the embedded clause and receives accusative case from matrix *v*, as in (42a). This analysis also accounts for the lack of pronoun raising in (33), since the pronoun is located in the embedded TP, as analyzed in (42b). Fronting would violate the clause-boundedness restriction on cliticization.

(42) a. 上 賢 使 之 為 三公。 *(Xunzi 12)*
Shang xian [vP [v v[Acc]] [vP shi [TP zhi[Acc] wei sangong]]].
most able make 3.OBJ be sangong
‘The most capable, make them into *sangong* (the highest official rank).’

b. 臧 氏 將 為 亂， 不 使 我 葬。
Zang shi jiang wei luan, bu shi [TP wo zang].
Zang clan will make rebellion not make us bury
‘The Zang clan is about to rebel, not allowing us to perform the funeral rites.’
 *(Zuozhuan, Xiang 23)*
A word must be said, however, about alternative approaches to ECM constructions. Many recent approaches to ECM constructions in English assume some version of raising into the matrix clause (Lasnik & Saito 1991; Johnson 1991; Koizumi 1993, 1995; Runner 1995, 1998; Lasnik 1995, 1999; and others). Empirical evidence for raising in English includes c-command evidence like the following, originally attributed to Postal (1974). In (43a), the embedded subject following the ECM verb clearly c-commands into the adjunct in the matrix clause. This contrasts with (43b), involving a finite embedded clause and therefore no possibility of raising of the embedded subject.

(43) a. The DA proved [the defendants [guilty]] during each other’s trials.  
    b. *The DP proved [that the defendants [were guilty]] during each other’s trials.

Another argument of Postal’s comes from the fact that the embedded subject can precede material in the matrix clause in surface order.

(44) I believed Nixon, foolishly, to be interested in the ending the war.

On Koizumi’s (1993, 1995) approach, the embedded subject raises to a vP-internal AgrO projection in the matrix clause. This allows the DP in question to receive case but not a θ-role in the matrix clause, accounting for the lack of thematic relation between the matrix verb and raised object.

(45) I [vP <I> expect [AgrOP her <expect> [vP <expect> [TP <her> to [vP <her> come]]]]]

Hornstein (1999, 2001) also proposes a raising approach to ECM. The embedded subject raises into the matrix VP, but it receives only case and not a θ-role.

(46) I [vP <I> expect [vP her <expect> [TP <her> to [vP <her> come]]]]
If raising is also the correct analysis for ECM in classical Chinese, then the lack of pronoun cliticization in (33) remains a problem, since the pronoun would be predicted to be able to cliticize to *bu* ‘not’ from its landing site in matrix VP.

There is evidence, however, that causative constructions with *shi* do not involve raising to object. First, I have found no word order evidence of the type in (44), in which the NP in question precedes material in the matrix clause. Secondly, quantifiers are allowed in embedded subject position. In section 3.1, I showed that quantifiers of this type were not allowed to surface VP-internally in classical Chinese. Therefore, the quantifiers in (47a&b) can only be analyzed as occupying embedded subject position, not having raised into the matrix VP. (47a) shows that *huo* ‘some’ readily appears in subject position. (47b) shows that the same quantifier appears embedded under *shi*. (47c) shows a similar pair involving *mo* ‘none’.

(47) a. 或 謂 孔子 曰 子 奚 不 為 政？
   *Huo* wei Kongzi yue zi xi bu wei zheng?
someone say Confucius C sir why not do government
   ‘Someone asked Confucius, “Why don’t you join the government?”’
   *(Analects 2)*

b. 使 或 美 , 或 惡
   *shi* [TP *huo* mei], [TP *huo* e]
   make some beautiful some ugly
   ‘make some of them beautiful and some of them ugly’

(47) c. 猶 使 同 事 者 莫 不 同 名 也。
   You *shi* [TP tong shi zhe *mo* bu tong ming ye].
   be.like make same substance DET none not same name DECL
   ‘It is like making nothing with the same substance not have the same name.’
   *(Xunzi 22)*

I conclude, then, that biclausal constructions involving *shi* ‘make’ are not derived through raising-to-object but rather must receive a traditional ECM analysis in which the embedded subject remains in the lower TP. This analysis eliminates the potential problem introduced by the lack of clitic crumbling from the complement of *shi* ‘make’. Given the analysis of this
construction in (33), the pronoun is contained within the embedded TP; raising would require movement across the embedded clause boundary.

The proposal that ECM in classical Chinese did not involve raising, however, requires a departure from Hornstein’s (1999, 2001) raising approach to ECM constructions. Regarding this potential objection, I will merely clarify the primary objective of this paper, which is to show that classical Chinese provides evidence for the raising analysis of control. Bear in mind that control is distinguished from ECM in the Government and Binding theory in that only the former involves PRO, and a main thrust of the movement approach to control is the elimination of this grammatical formative. On this understanding of the issue, then, it should be safe to conclude that my acceptance of the traditional approach to ECM constructions in classical Chinese is not a direct threat to Hornstein’s objective of eliminating PRO.

5. Fu and Bu: Two Types of ‘not’

This section dismisses a second apparent counterexample to the claim in this paper that cliticization from an embedded clause was parasitic on subject raising in the derivation of a control construction. The potential problem to be considered here is posed by biclausal examples when the matrix negator was fu ‘not’ and not bu ‘not’. I argue here that fu is not a counterexample.

As Ding (1933) first observed, fu was used widely in classical Chinese to negate transitive verbs when the object was not expressed. Bu, on the other hand, was used more widely, with both transitive and intransitive verbs, and regardless of whether the object of a transitive verb was overtly expressed. Ding summed up this contrast in distribution by positing that fu was functionally equivalent to bu plus the addition of a raised third person object pronoun zhi. The following examples show that bu ‘not’ was used to negate a VP which contains a pronoun other than zhi ‘3.Obj’, while fu ‘not’ was used when the VP contains a gap which is understood as third person.
Boodberg (1934) expanded on this observation and proposed that fu is the phonological fusion or contraction of bu and zhi. Boodberg reconstructs modern Mandarin bu as old Chinese /*piuə/ and fu as /*piuət/. The final /-t/ in fu is claimed to result from the fusion of the pronoun zhi, which is reconstructed with an initial /t-/.

If fu is indeed the phonological fusion of bu ‘not’ and zhi ‘3.Obj’, then the appearance of fu is a reflection that raising of zhi has taken place. If this is true, then examples with fu must be considered in an analysis of cliticization in classical Chinese. (49) and (50) do just this, by contrasting biclausal examples with fu and those with bu. The examples with bu are all cases in which raising fails to take place. (49) summarizes the frequencies in the earlier texts. The only cases without raising are the two examples we saw in (8) from the Analects of Confucius. The fact that the overwhelming majority of examples involve fu is consistent from the observation made in section 2 that raising was obligatory in the early classical period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books (up to 5th C. BCE)</th>
<th>弗 fu ‘not’</th>
<th>不 bu ‘not’</th>
<th>之 zhi ‘3.Obj’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of Songs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chunqiu Zuozhuan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analects</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in (50) are also consistent with the observation from section 2 that there was an overall decline in raising. However, the fact that cases involving fu are twice as frequent as
cases which lack raising with *bu* contradicts the main proposal of this paper that cliticization became clause-bound in the mid-classical period, if *fu* is to be analyzed as the fusion of *bu* and *zhi*. In other words, under the fusion analysis, the appearance of *fu* presupposes the raising of *zhi*.

(50) Books (4th–2nd C. BCE)  弗*fu* ‘not’  不*bu* ‘not’ ... 之*zhi* ‘3.Obj’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>弗</th>
<th>不</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mencius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuangzi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laozi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangjun Shu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanzi Chunqiu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xunzi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanfeiizi</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lüshi Chunqiu</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the view that *fu* is the fusion of *bu* ‘not’ and *zhi* ‘3.Obj’ is not widely accepted. Huang (1958), F. Zhou (1959), G. Zhou (1959), Feng (1984), Huang (1986), Gassmann (1993), Harbsmeier (1994), Yang and He (1992), Djamouri (2000), He (2004), and others have put forth opposing views. I argue here against the fusion analysis on the basis of syntactic evidence that *fu* is found in contexts which otherwise would not allow cliticization. Let me begin by returning to the biclausal data considered in sections 2 and 3. There were 59 examples of raising in the later period texts with *mo* ‘none’ and two examples of raising with *wei* ‘not.yet’. There were no examples of raising with *bu* ‘not’. I concluded on the basis of this that cliticization was essentially clause-bound in this period. If *fu* is analyzed as a reflection of raising, then it must be viewed as an exception.

Next, consider the ECM construction discussed in section 4. Recall that pronoun fronting does not take place from the embedded clause.
(51) **Zang shi jiang wei luan, bu shi [TP wo zang]**

Zang clan will make rebellion not make us bury

‘The Zang clan is about to rebel, not allowing us to perform the funeral rites.’

*(Zuozhuan, Xiang 23)*

However, *fu* can appear in front of *shi* ‘make’. If we were to analyze this as an instance of pronoun fronting, then ECM verbs would likewise need to be considered an exception to the otherwise general rule that pronoun fronting did not take place across a clause boundary.

(52) **Sui fu shi [TP __ xian].**

then not make contribute

‘So (he) did not let him let him contribute.’

*(Zuozhuan, Xiang 10)*

Further independent evidence I offer here comes from the locality condition on extraction from PPs discussed in section 2.2. In section 2.2, I showed that cliticization is blocked when the pronoun is contained in a PP.

(53) a. **Sui tian di fu zhui, yi jiang bu [yu zhi] yi.**

even heaven earth flip drop yet will not with 3.OBJ lose

‘Even if heaven drops and the earth flips over, (it) still will not be lost with them.’

*(Zhuangzi 1.5)*

b. **Bu [yu zhi] zheng neng.**

not with 3.OBJ dispute ability

‘(He) does not dispute ability with them.’

*(Xunzi 12)*
c. 民不為己用,不為己死,
Min bu wei ji yong, bu [wei ji] si,
people not by self use not for self die
而求兵之勁,城之固,
er qiu bing zhi jing, cheng zhi gu,
CONJ wish army GEN strong castle GEN secure
不可得也。
bu ke de ye.
not POT get DECL
‘If the people cannot be used by you or will not die for you, then (even if you)
wish for a strong army and secure castle, you won’t be able to have them.’

Fu, on the other hand, does occur with a PP.

(54) a. 秦弗與成。
Qin fu [yu ___] cheng.
Qin not with negotiate
‘The Qin did not negotiate with them.’

b. 荊人攻薛,夫子弗為憂,
Jing ren gong Xue, fuzi fu [wei ___] you,
Jing person attack Xue, you not about concern
文無以復待矣。
Wen wu yi fu dai yi.
I not.have C again treat ASP
‘The Jing have attacked Xue; if you are not concerned about this, then there is nothing I can do for you again.’
c. 百姓苦其勞\,而弗為用。
   Baixing ku qi lao, er fu [wei ___] yong.
   commoners suffer 3.GEN work CONJ not by use
   ‘The commoners suffered doing his work and would not be used by him.’
   (Mozi 49)

d. 父母怒之弗為改。
   Fumu nu zhi, fu [wei ___] gai.
   parents scold 3.OBJ not for change
   ‘His parents scold him, but he doesn’t change because of it.’
   (Hanfeizi 49)

As in the case of biclausal constructions, if we assume the fusion analysis of \(fu\), then the cases involving PPs must also be treated as exceptions. Furthermore, the cases in (54) would have to be analyzed as violating a locality constraint which has otherwise been shown to be exceptionless in the language. I therefore conclude that the appearance of \(fu\) in classical period texts was not a reflection of pronoun raising.

This leads, however, to the question of how to analyze \(fu\) and its distribution relative to \(bu\) ‘not’. First, it is well known that Ding’s (1933) generalization is plainly falsified by the pre-classical unearthed texts, i.e. the oracle bone inscriptions and the bronze inscriptions (J. Huang 1958, Zhou 1959, Y. Huang 1986, Gassmann 1993, Harbsmeier 1994, Wei 1999, Djamouri 2000, He 2004, and others). \(Fu\) very frequently occurred with an overt object in the early texts.

(55) a. 黃尹弗害王   \textit{(Heji 6946 recto; from Djamouri 2000)}
   Huangyin fu hai wang.
   ‘The ancestor Huangyin does not harm the king.’

b. 帝弗其降禍   \textit{(Heji 14176; from Djamouri 2000)}
   Di fu qi jiang huo.
   ‘Di will not send us harm.’
Huang (1958) offers additional examples from the Zhou period (approximately 6th century BCE) text *Shangshu*. In the following, *fu* cooccurs with an overt object.

(56) a. 弗用命，戮于社

Fu yong ming, lu yu she.

not obey order execute in shrine

‘If (you) do not obey (my) order, (you) will be executed in the shrine.’

b. 予有後，弗棄基

Yu you hou, fu qi ji.

1 have descendant not discard accomplishment

‘Having a descendant, I will not need to give up my accomplishments.’

Wei (1999) lists sixteen examples from classical period texts.

(57) a. 少秦師而弗設備。

Shao Qin shi er fu she bei.

underestimate Qin army CONJ not install defense

‘(They) underestimated the Qin forces and did not install defenses.’

b. 吾弗敬子矣。

Wu fu jing zi yi.

1 not respect sir ASP

‘I no longer respect you, sir.’

He lists 28 examples involving pronouns, either fronted with *fu*, as in (58a), or remaining in VP, as in (58b).
Wei (1999) treats the examples in (57) and (58) as exceptions and argues instead that the general rule in the classical period was for \( fu \) to not co-occur with an overt object. However, even he is forced to admit that his proposal is not consistent with the earlier texts, as in (55) and (56). He speculates that the discrepancy between the pre-classical and classical periods might have been the result of dialect variation. Wei suggests that the language of the oracle bone inscriptions, bronze inscriptions, and the \( Shangshu \) all reflect the prestige dialect of the Zhou capital. As the language of the capital, this dialect was subject to numerous influences and therefore reflects innovations not found in other regional varieties. In contrast to this, the classical period texts reflect various regional dialects which were probably more conservative.

Wei does not offer independent support for this speculation. Nor does he address obvious questions raised by this speculation, e.g. the relative uniformity of the grammars of the regional varieties. If they were truly so different from the central language, then they might be expected to also differ from one another in significant ways.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I assume the mainstream position (with Huang 1958, Huang 1986, Djamouri 2000, He 2004, and many others) that the pre-classical texts reflect an earlier stage in the development of the language. This returns us to the question of what, exactly, the difference between \( bu \) and \( fu \) was. Huang (1958) proposes that the functions of \( fu \) and \( bu \) were roughly equal, \( fu \) being somewhat more restricted in its use than \( bu \). Yang and He (1992), Djamouri (2000), and He (2004) have proposed that the restriction imposed on \( fu \) was that it could occur only with transitive VPs, while \( bu \) could occur with intransitive VPs.
Gassmann (1993) takes the connection with transitivity one step further by arguing that *fu* has the function of negating causative predicates. He proposes that *fu* is not the fusion of *bu* with the pronoun *zhi* but rather was the fusion of *bu* with the causative verb *shi* (*/*slieg*/).

I would like to entertain a revised version of Gassmann’s proposal. First, Huang (1958) has pointed out that Boodberg’s (1934) analysis of *fu* as the fusion of *bu* ‘not’ and *zhi* ‘3.Obj’ violates a general constraint on fusion in classical Chinese. The general rule is that when two syllables are fused into one, the fused form has the onset of the first member and the rhyme of the second. For example, the object pronoun *zhi* (*/*tiə*/) and a following preposition *於* *yu* (*/*ia*/) ‘in/at’ fused to produce 諸 *zhu* (*/*tia*/).

(59) 君子 求 諸 己, 小人 求 諸 人。
Junzi qiu zhu (=zhi+yu) ji, xiao ren qiu zhu ren.
gentleman seek 3.OBJ+P self small person seek 3.OBJ+P other
‘A superior man seeks it within himself, while a small-minded person demands it of others.’ (Analects 15)

Boodberg’s analysis of *fu* (*/*piuət*/) as the fusion of *bu* (*/*piuə*/) ‘not’ and *zhi* (*/*tiə*/) ‘3.Obj’ requires the reanalysis of the onset of the second member as the coda of the first, violating the general rule of fusion in classical Chinese. Unfortunately, Gassmann’s proposal makes the same mistake, since it requires fusion with the onset /*s-*/ of the second member rather than the rhyme. However, there is another possible account of the fusion of the negator *bu* with a causative morpheme. It is widely accepted that classical Chinese had a number of productive derivational affixes which were lost by early middle Chinese. One of these morphemes was the prefix /*s-*/, which Mei (1989) has argued to be associated with a causative function. For example, 飼 *si* (*/*sdjəks*/) ‘feed’ is derived from 食 *shi* (*/*djək*/) ‘eat’ by the addition of the causative prefix /*s-*/.

What this suggests for the topic at hand is that the origin of *fu* can be understood as the fusion of *bu* ‘not’ with the causative prefix /*s-*/. Since the prefix consists of only one segment, it can be reanalyzed as the coda of *bu* /*piuə*/ ‘not’ without violating the fusion rule. On the assumption that agentive predicates are selected by a causative light verb (Hale and Keyser 1993,
among many others), *fu /piuə/ ‘not’ can be derived from the following structure, either by cliticization of */s-/ to the negator or by morphological merger (in the sense of Marantz 1988) of the negator with the prefix.

\[ (60) \quad [\text{TP DP}_{\text{Subj}} [\text{NegP} \text{piuə} [\text{vP} <\text{DP}_{\text{Subj}} > [\text{vP} s- [\text{VP} ... ]]]]) \]

This accounts for the co-occurrence of *fu with transitive VPs. The relative insensitivity to the locality constraints which prevented overt pronoun raising is also accounted for straightforwardly, since no pronoun raising is posited to take place. Ding’s (1933) observation that the VP following *fu in the classical period generally contained a gap can be viewed as part of the growing trend through the classical period toward zero-pronominalization in object position (Wei 2004). The presence of *fu before a VP signaled that the VP was transitive; no overt pronoun was necessary for the purposes of disambiguation.

This analysis also allows a more plausible analysis of the historical change. In the pre-classical period, *fu occurred with VPs which contained overt objects. The subsequent popularity of the gap strategy was tied to the growth in zero-pronominalization. This allows us to discard the rather unsatisfying speculations Wei (1999) and also of Huang (1986). Huang’s speculation is that *bu and *fu were identical in function in the pre-classical period. In the classical period, *fu came to be used in place of *bu+zhi ‘not+3.Obj’. Then *bu and *fu reverted to their former functional identity in the Han period, apparently without motivation.

6. Conclusion

The main objective of this paper has been to propose a principled analysis of clitic climbing out of embedded clauses in classical Chinese. I have considered a combination of examples involving raising as well as lacking raising and proposed that all cliticization can be analyzed as clause-bound from the middle of the classical period. The one case which appears to continue to require clitic climbing, i.e. those examples in which the matrix subject is *mo ‘none’, can be subsumed under the local cliticization constraint by assuming Hornstein’s (1999, 2001) movement analysis of control. On this analysis, the pronoun cliticizes to *mo in the embedded
clause; the appearance of clitic climbing is the result of the pronoun being pied-piped to the matrix clause with the subject *mo* ‘none’.

This paper has made additional claims regarding the analysis of ECM constructions in classical Chinese and the origin of the negator *fu*. I have shown that exceptional case-marking into embedded clauses selected by the causative verb *shi* must not be analyzed as raising to matrix object position. Regarding the origin of *fu*, I have argued on the basis of both syntactic and phonological evidence that it was not derived through the fusion of the negator *bu* and a raised third person object pronoun *zhi*. Rather, I have suggested that *fu* can be analyzed as the fusion of *bu* and the causative prefix /*s-*/. Though secondary to the main claims put forth in this paper, the conclusions and predictions of these proposals serve to substantiate the applicability of Generative theoretical analysis to the study of historical Chinese syntax and further illuminate how phenomena here-to-fore largely ignored in the Generative tradition can inform theoretical syntactic investigations.
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Notes

1. It should be noted that all texts included in the survey are received texts and not unearthed texts.
2. In both of these exceptions, the negator is *wei* ‘not yet’ and the raising verb is *neng* ‘can’. There is clear evidence in the Han period that *neng* ‘can’ involves a mono-clausal structure. However, in the later classical period, many of the examples lacking clitic climbing (summarized in (7)) involve *neng* ‘can’ as the matrix verb, indicating that it was still able to embed a full clausal complement during this period. The only explanation I can offer at this time is that *neng* ‘can’ was in the process of being reanalyzed and therefore sometimes involved a biclausal structure and sometimes a monoclausal one. It may be relevant to note that the two raising examples occur in very late classical period texts: *Xunzi* and *Lüshi Chunqiu*.
3. I have no explanation at present for the single exception in the early classical period. I will only mention here that there are numerous cases in the classical period in which cliticization failed to take place, in monoclausal as well as biclausal contexts (Djamouri 2000, F. Zhou 1959, G. Zhou 1959, and others). The reasons for this are not fully understood and investigation of them is beyond the scope of this paper.
4. The pronoun *yan* does not raise and attach to *mo* ‘none’. In fact, the oblique pronoun *yan* never underwent cliticization in the classical period. The exact reason for this is unknown, but perhaps this provides evidence that *yan* was prosodically heavier than other pronouns which did raise.