Focus and Old Chinese Word Order
Edith Aldridge, University of Washington

1. Introduction

This paper has two main goals. The primary goal is to address the controversy over whether pre-Old Chinese had VO or OV basic word order. I show in this paper that purported vestiges of OV order in the attested records cannot be used as evidence for base-generated OV word order and must instead be analyzed as derived through movement. Secondarily, I propose that the three types of object fronting I examine here were motivated by focus.

Though the oldest surviving Chinese texts show the language to have predominately SVO word order, there are some contexts in which the object can appear in preverbal position. One such case was when the object was a wh-phrase. Non-interrogative objects generally remained in their post-verbal base positions, as can be seen in the second clause in (1b). These examples are taken from Warring States Period (5th-3rd centuries BCE) texts. Most of the data cited in this paper date from this period.

(1) a. 天下之父歸之，
   Tianxia zhi fu gui zhi
   world Gen father settle here
   其子焉往？
   q i z i yan [VP wang tyan]?
   3.Gen son where go
   ‘If the fathers of the world settled here, where would their sons go?’

b. 吾誰欺？欺天乎？
   Wu shei [VP qi tsh e i]? Qi tian hu?
   I who deceive deceive Heaven Q
   ‘Who do I deceive? Do I deceive Heaven?’

Another context in which OV order can be observed is the fronting of pronominal objects in the context of negation. (2a) shows that pronominal objects remain in their base positions when negation is not present. (2b) shows fronting of the object to a position following the negative quantifier mo.

(2) a. 夫人幼而學之，壯而欲行之。
   Fu ren you er xue zhi, zhuang er yu xing zhi.
   Dem person young Conj study 3.Obj mature Conj want do 3.Obj
   ‘When a person is young, he studies this. When he matures, he wants to put it to practice.’
   (Mencius 2)

---

1 This paper was presented at the 18th meeting of the International Association of Chinese Linguistics (IACL), in conjunction with the 22nd meeting of the North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics (NACCL), at Harvard University on May 20, 2010. I thank fellow conference participants for comments on the presentation, especially FU Jingqu, Barabara Meisterernst, Waltraud Paul, Ken Takashima, XU Dan, and XU Zheng.
b. 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.’

Cases like (1) and (2) have prompted Wang (1958), Feng (1996), Xu (2006), and many others to suggest that the unmarked position for pronominal objects in Old or pre-Old Chinese may have been preverbal, while full NP objects remained post-verbal. However, other than pronoun fronting to negation, there is no evidence of general object cliticization to the verb in Old Chinese. Furthermore, object fronting was not limited to pronouns. (3) shows full NPs occurring in post-verbal (3a) and pre-verbal (3b) position. This alternation is relatively rare in the case of full NPs, but can be observed with somewhat greater frequency in the case of the light verb YI\(^2\) than with other verbs.

(3) a. 所謂大臣者, 以道事君。
(Analects 11)
Suo wei da chen zhe, yi dao shi jun.
Rel call great minister Det use Way serve lord
‘One who is referred to as a great minister serves his lord according to the Way.’

b. 弓以招士, 皮冠以招虞人。
(3b) (Zuo zhuan, Zhao 20)
gong yi zhao shi, pi guan yi zhao yuren.
bow use call gentleman leather cap use call gamekeeper
‘(He) summoned a gentleman in his employ by use of a bow, and the gamekeeper by use of a leather cap.’

Returning to the debate regarding basic word order in Old Chinese, Li & Thompson (1974), Wang (1958), La Polla (1994), Feng (1996), Xu (2006), and others view pre-verbal objects in (1)-(3) as vestiges of basic OV order in pre-Old Chinese, while Djamouri (2005), Peyraube (1986), Shen (1992), Djamouri & Paul (2009), and others argue that VO has been the basic order throughout the attested history of Chinese and that there is no attested evidence for earlier OV basic order. In this paper, I contribute evidence for the VO analysis by showing that OV orders must be analyzed as derived.

2 In this paper, I tentatively treat YI as a light verb located on the clausal spine. Detailed analysis of the position and function of YI is the object of future research. See Zou (1993), Sybesma (1999), Whitman (2000), Whitman & Paul (2005), and others for similar analyses of modern Mandarin BA, whose functions overlap in significant ways with Old Chinese YI.
2.1. *Wh*-Movement

In this subsection, I examine the case of *wh*-fronting. First, note that the landing site for *wh*-movement was not immediate pre-verbal position. (4) shows that *wh*-phrases had to precede negation. Since the *wh*-phrase is not adjacent to verb which selects it, this position cannot be analyzed as the base position for the object.

(4)  

a. 何 春 不 克?  
He cheng bu ke?  
what city Neg conquer  
‘What city would (you) not conquer?’

b. 然则 我 何 爲 乎 何 不 爲 乎?  
Ranze wo he wei hu? He bu wei hu?  
then I what do Q what Neg do Q  
‘Then what should I do? What should I not do?’

Similar evidence comes from long distance *wh*-fronting. The *wh*-phrase appears in a position to the left of the matrix verb and is separated from the verb which selects it, i.e. the embedded verb. Hence, these *wh*-phrases also cannot be analyzed as base-generated in their surface positions.

(5)  

a. 公 誰 欲 與?  
Gong shei yu [yu e ]?  
you who want give  
‘Who do you want to give (it) to?’

b. 吾 誰 敢 怨?  
Wu shei gan [yuan e ]?  
I who dare resent  
‘Who do I dare to resent?’

The next set of examples shows *wh*-fronting from subject position in an embedded clause. Aldridge (2009) argues that the causative verb *shi* is an ECM verb and not an object control verb. Therefore, the NP following *shi* is not selected by *shi* but is rather the subject in the embedded clausal complement. If we accept this analysis, then a *wh*-phrase preceding *shi* also cannot be analyzed as a base-generated pre-verbal object of *shi*, since this NP is not selected by *shi* in the first place.

(6)  

a. 若 子 死, 將 誰 使 代 子?  
Ruo zi si, jiang shei shi [ e dai zi]?  
if you die Mod who make replace you  
‘If you die, who shall I have replace you?’

b. 吾 誰 使 正 之?  
Wu shei shi [ e zheng zhi]?  
i who make correct 3.Obj  
‘Who shall I have correct it?’
Aldridge (2010) analyzes *wh*-movement in Old Chinese as short fronting to a clause-medial focus position. Specifically, she proposes that Old Chinese had positions in the edge of *vP* for topic and focus, following similar proposals for Italian by Belletti (2004) and for modern Chinese by Paul (2005).

\[
\begin{align*}
CP & \\
\text{OP} & \quad C' \\
C & \quad TP \\
\text{DP}_{\text{Subj}} & \quad T' \\
T & \quad vP \\
\text{XP}_{\text{[Foc, Wh]}} & \quad v' \\
t_{\text{Subj}} & \quad v' \\
v_{\text{[Foc*]}} & \quad \text{VP} \\
\ldots & \quad t_{\text{XP}} \
\end{align*}
\]

Aldridge (2010) additionally argues that *wh*-fronting was not cliticization, contra Feng (1996). Feng (1996) proposes that pronoun fronting to negation and *wh*-movement were both instances of cliticization. Pronoun fronting in negative contexts is fairly straightforward. The pronoun raises out of VP and right-adojins to the negator.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NegP} & \\
\text{Neg} & \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{Neg} & \quad \text{Cl}_{i} \quad \text{V} \quad t_{i} 
\end{align*}
\]

For *wh*-movement, Feng claims that the *wh*-word first moves to the edge of VP, where it receives focus interpretation. Subsequently, the *wh*-word is left-adojoined to the verb.
Aldridge (2010) offers the following arguments that wh-fronting cannot be cliticization. First, Feng claims that wh-words must be immediately adjacent to the verb. But we have seen that this is not the case. (4) shows that wh-fronting targets a position above negation. Secondly, we have seen that wh-fronting is not limited to posodically light elements. (4a) shows movement of a phrasal wh-constituent. Furthermore, (10) shows that a prosodically heavy mono-syllabic wh-word like yan ‘where’ also underwent fronting.

The non-interrogative counterpart yan ‘there’ did not front in the context of negation. The interrogative ‘where’ and non-interrogative ‘there’, both pronounced yan in modern Mandarin, are reconstructed in Old Chinese as a heavy syllable with a coda consonant (Wang 1958).³

³ Thanks to Zev Handel for first pointing out to me that the reconstruction of the two pronouns should be similar, if not the same.
Since Feng analyzes both *wh*-movement and pronoun fronting to negation as cliticization, we expect parallel behavior in both cases. This makes the asymmetry between (10) and (11) surprising. Likewise, the asymmetry seen in (12) and (13) is also unexpected. In addition to objects in verbal projections, objects of prepositions also underwent *wh*-fronting.

(12) a. 王  誰  與  為  善  ?  
   Wang  [shei  [yu  e ]]  wei  shan?  
   king  who  with  be  good  
   ‘With whom will the king be good?’  

b. 如  伋  去,  君  誰  與  守  ?  
   Ru  Ji  qu,  jun  [shei  [yu  e ]]  shou?  
   if  Ji  leave  you  who  with  serve  
   ‘If I (Ji) left, with whom would you serve?’

The situation is different with negation, however. As I will discuss in section 3.1, pronoun fronting could be observed in the context shown in (12) prior to the Warring States Period. However, from the 4th century BCE, negation was no longer able to attract a pronoun from inside a PP.

(13) a. 齊  人  莫  如  我  敬  王。  
   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. 不  與  之  爭  能。  
   Bu  [yu  zhi]  zheng  neng.  
   not  with  3.Obj  dispute  ability  
   ‘(He) does not dispute ability with them.’

In the above discussion, I have established the following two points. *Wh*-fronting could not have been base-generation of the object in pre-verbal position, since the position for pre-verbal *wh*-phrases is not the complement of the verb selecting this constituent. *Wh*-fronting was also not cliticization, since *wh*-fronting was not limited to prosodically weak elements and was not associated with a host such as the verb. I therefore conclude that preverbal *wh*-phrases achieved their position via syntactic focus movement.
2.2. Pronoun Fronting to Negation

Pronoun fronting to negation is an extremely complex phenomenon. By the 4th century BCE, this fronting was undoubtedly a process of cliticization which right-joined the pronoun to the negator triggering the movement. I thus accept the basic import of Feng’s (1996) analysis for pronoun fronting to negation during the Warring States Period. However, as I will discuss briefly in section 3.1, pronoun fronting may have its origin in a type of syntactic movement. Therefore, what we see in the Warring States Period is the result of a reanalysis. Another complicating factor is that, even from the 4th century BCE, pronoun fronting was subject to different constraints, depending on the negator which triggered the movement. In this subsection, I will simply offer some evidence that pronoun fronting cannot be analyzed as base-generation of the object in pre-verbal position. I concentrate here on the negative quantifier mo ‘none’ and the aspectual negator wei ‘not yet’, which were more conservative than the clausal negator bu ‘not’, and retained the ability to attract a pronoun across a clause boundary throughout the Warring States Period.

The key evidence against base generation which I offer here is the possibility of long distance movement, which can be found in the case of both mo ‘none’ and wei ‘not yet’ throughout the Warring States Period.

(14) a. 虎負嶠, 莫之敢撄。

Hu fu yu, mo zhi gan [ying ___].
‘The tiger backed into a crevice and no one dared to approach it.’

b. 日夜思之, 猶未之能得。

Ri ye si zhi, you wei zhi neng [de ___].
‘(They) think about this day and night and still are not able to obtain it.’

(14) is from Mencius 14.

Prior to the 4th century BCE, long distance fronting can also be found with bu ‘not’. However, as I discuss in section 3.1, fronting to bu ‘not’ became extremely local after the 4th century BCE.

(15) a. 余不女忍殺。

Yu bu ru ren [sha ___].
‘I cannot bear to kill you.’

b. 楚君之惠, 未之敢忘。

Chu jun zhi hui, wei zhi gan [wang ___].
‘(He) has not dared to forget the generosity of the lord of Chu.’

(15) is from Zuozhuan, Zhao 1.

Because the pronoun could front to a position in the higher clause, the pre-verbal pronoun cannot be analyzed as base-generated in this position. Pronoun fronting in this period is uncontroversially not associated with focus. However, in section 3.1, I will present evidence that in Pre-Old Chinese pronoun fronting may have originated in a focus movement construction.
2.3. V NP/NP V

The final case of pre-verbal objects which I examine in this paper is the fronting of full NPs to the left of the light verb YI. Basic examples are repeated below. (16a) shows the NP following YI. (16b) shows NPs preceding YI. Let me point out in passing here that (16b) shows parallel clauses. Nearly all cases of NP fronting to the left of YI are cases of this type, which I suggest below is related to focus.

(16) a. 所謂大臣者，以道事君。 (*Analects* 11)

Suo wei da chen zhe, yi dao shi jun.

‘One who is referred to as a great minister serves his lord according to the Way.’

b. 弓以招士，皮冠以招虞人。

Gong yi zhao shi, pi guan yi zhao yuren.

‘(He) summoned a gentleman in his employ by use of a bow, and the gamekeeper by use of a leather cap.’

(Zuo zhuan, Zhao 20)

The table in (17) summarizes the occurrences of YI with post- and pre-verbal NPs in the first few chapters of the 5th century BCE text *Zuo zhuan*. Post-verbal NPs make up the overwhelming majority.

(17) | YI NP: 278 (73%) | NP YI: 104 (27%) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YI NP</td>
<td>YI VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin:</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huan:</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuang-Min:</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xi:</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen:</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>218 (57%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the pre-verbal NPs, a significant number of them are *wh*-words. Given that the language had *wh*-movement, these examples pose no problem for the current proposal that pre-verbal objects achieved their position through movement.

(18) a. 失忠與敬，何以事君？ (*Zuo zhuan*, Xi 5)

Shi zhong yu jing, he yi shi jun?

‘Having lost loyalty and respect, what does one serve his lord with?’

b. 吾何以堪之？ (*Zuo zhuan*, Xi 30)

Wu he yi kan zhi?

‘How do I rate such treatment?’
The largest number of fronting cases involves the demonstrative pronoun *shi*. *Shi* is fronted in all but one of the examples I have found in the *Zuo zhuan* involving *shi* and YI.

(19) a. 夫 名 以 制 義， 義 以 出 禮。
    Fu ming yi zhi yi, yi yi chu li,
    Dem name YI set right right YI emerge rites
    禮 以 體 政， 政 以 正 民。
    li yi ti zheng, zheng yi zheng min,
    rites YI embody government government YI correct people
    是 以 政 成 而 民 聽。
    shi yi zheng cheng er min ting.
    SHI YI government mature Conj people obey

   ‘With a name, (a ruler) determines the codes of righteousness; from righteousness the rites of proper conduct emerge; the rites determine the form of good government; with good government, the people are led into correct conduct. It is in this way that the government matures and the people become obedient.’ (*Zuo zhuan*, Huan 2)

b. 既 無 德 政， 又 無 威 刑。
    Conj wu de zheng, you wu wei xing,
    since not.have virtuous govt. Conj not.have imposing penalty
    是 以及 邪。
    shi yi ji xie.
    SHI YI reach evil

   ‘Lacking in both virtuous government and an imposing penal code, this is what leads to evil.’

c. 君子 是 以 知 桓 王 之 失 鄭 也。
    Junzi shi yi zhi Huan Wang zhi shi Zheng ye.
    gentleman SHI YI know Huan king Gen lose Zheng Decl

   ‘It was in this way that the learned men of the realm learned that King Huan had lost Zheng.’ (*Zuo zhuan*, Yin 11))

Recall that Wang (1958), Feng (1996), Xu (2006), and others have noted that pre-verbal objects in Old Chinese tend to be pronominal. If there truly is a correlation to be grasped here, it may be related to the semantic nature of pronouns themselves. As anaphoric elements, they take antecedents in the preceding discourse. Note that this is true for all of the cases involving fronted *shi* in (19). In (19b), for example, *shi* refers to the lack of good government and a strong penal code introduced in the immediately preceding context. Note also that *shi* is focused. The point made in this sentence is that precisely these factors are what account for the resulting evil.

   The case of full NP fronting is likewise related to information structure. In (20a), for example, the fronted NPs in the second line have been introduced in the first line. Note further the parallelism, specifically that multiple NPs are fronted and contrasted with each other. Hence, we have examples of contrastive topics.

(20) a. 君子 謂 鄭 莊 公 失 政 刑 矣。
    Junzi wei Zheng Zhuang gong shi zheng xing yi.
    gentleman say Zheng Zhuang lord lose govt. penalty Asp
Let me turn briefly to the one example I have found in the Zuozhuang in which shi follows Yi. Significantly, Yi and shi appear in an embedded clause, specifically a conditional clause. If we assume that focalization and topicalization are root clause phenomena, then (21) gives indirect support to the proposal that object fronting involves information structure related movement. In other words, this movement would not be expected in embedded contexts.

(21) 以是始賞，天啟之矣。 (Zuozhuan, Min 1)
[Yi shi shi shang] tian qi zhi yi.
Yi SHI begin award Heaven aid 3. Obj Asp
‘If this is how the award begins, then Heaven has aided him.’

From the discussion in this section, we can conclude that pre-verbal objects were not base-generated in their surface positions. Wh-movement and NP-fronting also show that movement was associated with either a syntactic or information structure-related trigger, specifically some type of focus. In the next section, I speculate that pronoun fronting to negation may also have originated as a type of focus movement.

3. Reanalysis of Syntactic Movement as Cliticization

This section discusses historical changes in pronoun fronting to negation and wh-movement. I suggest that both were reanalyzed from syntactic movement to cliticization.

3.1. Pronoun-fronting to Negation

It is uncontroversial that pronoun fronting to negation in the Warring States Period was not directly related to information structure and is probably best analyzed as a type of cliticization. However, there is reason to believe that this cliticization was formerly syntactic movement for focus. Djamouri (2000) argues that examples like those in (22) from Shang bone inscriptions (14th – 11th C. BCE) involve a type of cleft construction in which the focused constituent – fu yi ‘father Yi’ in both cases – is preceded by a copular. In negative contexts, the copula is the clausal negator bu ‘not’. 
Djamouri hypothesizes that fronting to negation possibly originates in a cleft construction of this type. He notes that there is evidence even in the Warring States Period for residual focus effects. Fronting did not take place, for example, when a **wh**-word appeared in the same clause, as shown in (23a). On the assumption that one clause typically has only one focused constituent, the lack of pronoun fronting is accounted for, since fronting would introduce a second focus in the clause. Fronting was also much less common in embedded clauses, particularly those which were topicalized, as in (23b). The lack of pronoun fronting here can be explained since the focus interpretation induced by fronting might introduce an incompatibility with the presuppositional nature of the clause.

In addition to Djamouri’s (2000) information structure evidence, I offer a syntactic argument. We saw in section 2.1 that pronoun fronting from a PP had been lost by the 4th century BCE. However, in the 5th century BCE, this fronting was possible. What I suggest here is that this movement was feature-driven focus fronting. The pronoun is focused. However, since it is contained within the PP adjunct, it cannot move out of this constituent without violating the Condition on Extraction Domain (CED). Therefore, the entire PP appears in pre-verbal focus position and the pronoun fronts to the edge (specifier) of the PP.
There is a precedent for this analysis in Aissen’s (1996) proposal of *wh*-pied-piping in Tzotzil. (25a) shows that PPs are head-initial in Tzotzil. However, when a PP contains a *wh*-word, the *wh*-word must precede the preposition. Aissen analyzes this as movement of the *wh*-word to the specifier of the PP, followed by pied-piping of the entire PP to [Spec, CP].

(25) a. I-kom [PP ta s-na].

   CP-remain P A3-house
   ‘He remained in his house.’

b. [CP [PP Buch’u [P’ ta [DP s-na t-wh ]] [C’ C+[WH] [IP ch-a-bat tpp ]]]

   who P A3-house
   ‘To whose house did you go?’

The same analysis applies in the case of *wh*-fronting within a PP in Old Chinese, which I mentioned briefly in section 2.1.

(26) 吾 又 誰 與 爭？

Wu you [PP shei [P’ yu tshei ]] zheng]??

I then who with compete
‘Then who would we compete with?’

(Zuozhuan, Zhao 4)

The proposal that fronting in PPs is syntactic focus movement allows us to account for the loss of this movement in a straightforward way. Since the PP must appear in pre-verbal focus position, we can assume that a [Foc] feature appears on the P head itself. Fronting of the pronoun to [Spec, PP] can also be assumed to be driven by this [Foc] feature on P. When the association with focus is lost, i.e. the [Foc] feature on P is lost, fronting of the object of a preposition is also lost. This is due to the fact that the sole trigger for movement is now the negator, which cannot probe inside of the adjunct PP (which is an island) to attract the pronoun.

Interestingly, long distance fronting across a clause boundary remains possible for *mo* ‘none’ and *wei* ‘not yet’ until the end of the Warring States Period, as mentioned in section 2.2. This is possible, because the pronoun originates as the complement of the embedded verb and can therefore serve as the goal for a probe on c-commanding negation without invoking island constraints.

For reasons which are still mysterious, however, fronting to the clausal negator 不 *bu* ‘not’ became very local from the 4th century BCE. Fronting to *bu* ‘not’ from this time was only possible when the pronoun was base-generated as the sole complement of a verb with clause-mate negation.

(27) 我 飢 而 不 我 食。

Wo ji er bu wo si ___.

1 starve Conj BU 1 feed
‘When I was starving, (they) did not feed me.’

(Lü Shi Chunqiu 12.5)

Not only was fronting disallowed from PPs, but also from embedded clauses, regardless of whether the pronoun is base merged as the embedded object or the subject.
Fronting was also lost from the specifier of VP or a small clause.

Interestingly, fronting from the specifier of VP was possible in the 5th century BCE. Recall from section 2.2 that long distance fronting to ‘not’ across a clause boundary was also possible prior to the 5th century BCE.

The reason for the greater locality restriction on fronting to ‘not’ is not presently known. What is clear, however, is that movement was lost in certain structural contexts. In particular, movement within PPs was lost for all negators during the Warring States Period. We can account for the loss of movement as the loss of association with focus. C-commanding negation was then reanalyzed as the trigger for movement – and hence the host for cliticization. However, the Agree relation licensing clitic movement was blocked by a PP island barrier.

### 3.2. *Wh*-movement

In this subsection, I argue that *wh*-movement was also reanalyzed as a type of cliticization. The reanalysis took place later than the reanalysis of pronoun fronting, not beginning until the Han period (2nd century BCE).
Wh-fronting was retained for monosyllabic wh-words but not for phrasal wh-constituents, suggesting a prosodic basis for the fronting.

(31) a. 子 將 何 欲？ (Shiji 86)
   Zi jiang he [vp yu tē]?
   You Mod what want
   “What do you want?”

   b. 此 固 其 理 也，有 何 怨 乎？ (Shiji 81)
   Ci gu qi li ye, [vp you he yuan] hu?
   this Adv Dem way Decl have what complaint Q
   “This is the way things are; what complaint could you have?”

Unsurprisingly, wh-fronting was lost in PPs.

(32) 陛下 與 誰 取 天下 與？ (Shiji 55)
   Bixia [yu shei] qu tianxia hu?
   sire with who conquer world Q
   ‘Sire, with whom will you conquer the world?’

Long distance fronting was also lost. What is observed instead is movement within the embedded clause. This movement suggests that wh-cliticization takes the verb as its host. If Feng’s (1996) analysis of wh-movement in the Warring States Period were correct, this is what we would expect to see in that period. Rather, this pattern does not emerge until centuries later.

(33) a. 諸 君 欲 誰 立？ (Shiji 43)
   Zhu jun yu [shei li ___]?
   all gentleman want who stand
   ‘Gentlemen, who do you want to place (on the throne)?’

   b. 吾 敢 誰 怨 乎？ (Shiji 31)
   Wu gan [shei yuan ___] hu?
   I dare who resent Q
   ‘Who do I dare to resent?’

In this section, I have provided evidence that pronoun fronting to negation may have been syntactic focus movement in pre-Old Chinese. This movement was later reanalyzed as cliticization after the loss of the [Foc] feature driving the syntactic movement. Indirect support for the reanalysis of syntactic movement to cliticization is offered by the case of wh-fronting, which clearly shows a change from relatively unbounded syntactic movement in the Warring States Period to very local movement in the Han Period. We can account for this change by proposing that syntactic movement was reanalyzed as cliticization.

4. Conclusion

The main purpose of this paper has been to show that OV word order in Old Chinese does not reflect base-generated OV word order but must rather be analyzed as transformationally derived.
Secondarily, I have argued that all three types of movement examined here were (historically) a type of focus movement.
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