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This paper challenges a widely held assumption that the existence of constructions in Archaic Chinese in which an object appeared in preverbal position provides evidence that Pre-Archaic Chinese had OV basic word order. I argue that the preverbal objects in questions – *wh*-phrases and focused NPs – could not have been base-generated in their surface positions but rather must be analyzed as having undergone syntactic movement. I further show that the trigger for this movement was focus.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper analyzes two constructions employing preverbal objects in Archaic Chinese and proposes that the object in both cases achieves its position through syntactic focus movement. In arguing that the OV order seen in these constructions is a derived order, this paper also contributes to the debate on Archaic Chinese basic word order by challenging an assumption in the field that preverbal object positioning in these constructions constitutes evidence for basic OV order.

Although texts show the language to have predominately SVO word order, there are some contexts in which the object appeared in preverbal position. One such case was when the object was a *wh*-phrase. In the examples in (1), non-interrogative objects appear post-verbally, while *wh*-words precede the verb.¹

(1) a. 天下 之 父 归 之,
   Tianxia zhi fu gui zhi
   world Gen father settle here
   其 子 阿 往?

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all examples are taken from Warring States Period (5th-3rd centuries BCE) texts.
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，
Dem person young Conj study 3.Obj
‘When a person is young, he studies this. When he matures, he wants to put it to practice.’

b. 吾先君亦莫之行也。
1  former lord also none 3.Obj do  Decl
‘None of our former lords did this either.’

The preverbal positioning of the objects in examples 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 Archaic or pre-Archaic Chinese may have been preverbal, while full NP objects remained in post-verbal position. The validity of this position is challenged, however, by the fact that object fronting was not limited to pronouns. (3) shows that full NPs could also occur in post-verbal (3a) or pre-verbal (3b) position.

2 For reasons which are not yet well understood, NP-fronting was more common with yi ‘use’ than with other verbs. In this paper, I tentatively assume yi to be a light verb heading a functional projection on the clausal spine. Detailed analysis of the position and function of YI is the subject of future research. See Zou (1993), Sybesma (1999), Whitman (2000), Whitman & Paul (2005), and others for similar treatment of modern Mandarin ba, whose functions overlap in significant ways with Archaic Chinese YI.
Returning to the debate regarding basic word order in Archaic 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-Archaic Chinese, while Djamouri (2005), Peyraube (1996), Shen (1992), Djamouri, Paul, and Whitman (2007), Djamouri & Paul (2009), and others argue that VO has been the basic order throughout the attested history of Chinese and that there is no evidence for earlier OV basic order. In this paper, I contribute argumentation for the VO analysis. I show that that OV orders could not have been base-generated. I further identify a motivation for the movement, which is focus.

2. WH-MOVEMENT
In this and the following two sections, I examine two of the cases of object fronting introduced in the previous section and show that neither of them should be analyzed as base-generated OV order. In this section, I show that the preverbal objects in wh-questions could appear in a position which could not be analyzed as the verb’s complement. I also argue that wh-fronting was syntactic movement and not cliticization. In section 3, I show that full NPs could appear before the light verb yi only when they were focused and therefore should also be analyzed as having undergone syntactic movement.

I do not discuss pronoun fronting to negation in this paper. This phenomenon is addressed in Aldridge (in preparation), where I also propose a syntactic movement analysis, specifically object shift for the purpose of checking structural accusative case.

2.1. WH-MOVEMENT AS OPPOSED TO BASE GENERATION
In this subsection, I show that wh-fronting cannot be analyzed as base-generated OV order. First, note that the landing site for wh-movement was not immediate preverbal position. (4) shows that wh-phrases 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. 何城不克?  
He cheng bu ke?  
‘What city would (you) not conquer?’

b. 然則我何為乎何不為乎?  
Ranze wo he wei hu? He bu wei hu?  
‘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]?  
‘Who do you want to give (it) to?’

b. 吾誰敢怨?  
Wu shei gan [yuan e]?  
‘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. On this analysis, the wh-words preceding shi in (6) are not internal arguments selected by shi but are rather the subjects of the embedded clausal complements.

(6) a. 若子死，將誰使代子?  
Ruo zi si, jiang shei shi [e dai zi]?  
‘If you die, who shall I have replace you?’

b. 吾誰使正之?  
Wu shei shi [e zheng zhi]?  
‘Who shall I have correct it?’

I assume Aldridge’s (2010) analysis of wh-movement in Archaic Chinese as fronting to a focus position in the edge of vP. This analysis is informed by similar proposals of A’
positions for topic and focus in the vP layer in Italian (Belletti 2004) and modern Mandarin (Paul 2005).

(7)  

\[
\text{CP} \\
\text{OP} \quad \text{C'} \\
\text{C} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{Subj}} \quad \text{T'} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{vP} \\
\text{XP}_{[\text{Foc, Wh}]} \quad \text{v'} \\
\text{t}_{\text{Subj}} \quad \text{v'} \\
\text{v}_{[\text{Foc}^*]} \quad \text{VP} \\
\ldots \text{t}_{\text{XP}} \ldots
\]

2.2. WH-MOVEMENT NOT CLITICIZATION

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. In the context of negation, the pronoun raises out of VP and right-adoins to the negator.

(8)  

a. 不 患 人 之 不 己 知。
   Bu huan ren zhi bu ji zhi ___.
   not worry others Gen not self understand
   ‘Do not worry that others do not understand you.’  (Analects 1)

b. NegP
   Neg Cl_i V t_i

(Feng 1996:343)

For wh-movement, Feng claims that the wh-word first moves to the edge of VP, where it receives a focus interpretation. Subsequently, the wh-word is left-adjoined to the verb.
Examples (4) and (5) in section 2.1 present problems for this analysis, because the *wh*-phrase appears separated from the VP where it was base merged. The examples in (4) further show that *wh*-fronting targets a VP-external position above negation. The possibility of phrasal *wh*-movement in (4a) also suggests that *wh*-movement is syntactic and not prosodic cliticization.

Furthermore, it is clear that *wh*-movement and pronoun fronting to negation are not the same type of movement. Note (10), where *wh*-word *yan* ‘where’ undergoes *wh*-fronting.

(10) 下 之 父 归 之。
天[xia zhi fu gui zhi
world Gen father settle here
其 子 焉 往?
qi zi yan [VP wang tyan ]?
3.Gen son where go
‘If the fathers of the world settled here, where would their sons go?’

On the other hand, the non-interrogative counterpart *yan* ‘there’ does not front in the context of negation. The interrogative ‘where’ and non-interrogative ‘there’, both pronounced *yan* in modern Mandarin, are also reconstructed in Archaic Chinese with the same or very similar pronunciations (Wang 1958). Crucially, both are reconstructed as mono-syllabic and having a coda consonant. Therefore, we do not expect them to behave differently with respect to prosodic processes.

---

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.
(11) a. 出妻屏子，終身不養焉。
Chu qi bing zi, zhongxhen bu yang yan.
dispatch wife discard child lifelong not care.for 3.Dat
‘(He) sent his wife away and abandoned his children and was not cared for by them for the rest of his life.’  (Mencius 8)

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

Likewise, the asymmetry in (12) and (13) is also unexpected on Feng’s analysis. In addition to objects in verbal projections, objects of prepositions also undergo wh-fronting.

(12) a. 王誰與為善？
W a n g [shei [yu e ]] wei shan?
king who with be good
‘With whom will the king be good?’  (Mencius 6)

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. Negation is not 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 sum, based on the landing site of the movement shown in (4) and (5) and the lack of similarity between wh-fronting and pronoun fronting to negation, I conclude that wh-movement and pronoun fronting should not be analyzed as the same type of movement. The fact that wh-fronting could target a phrasal constituent, as shown in (4a), further argues that wh-movement could not have been cliticization.
2.3. *WH*-WORDS NOT 2ND POSITION CLITICS
A second analysis based on cliticization is offered by Shi and Xu (2001). Their proposal is similar to Feng (1996) in that they also claim that Archaic Chinese *wh*-words were simultaneously clitics and focused constituents. Specifically, Shi and Xu propose that Archaic Chinese *wh*-words were Wackernagel-type second position clitics. They also carried a [+F] focus feature which provided the motivation for their movement.

This proposal suffers from some of the same weaknesses as Feng (1996). The possibility of phrasal movement in (4a) is particularly damaging. There is also very clear evidence that Archaic Chinese *wh*-words were not restricted to second position. For example, if the modal *jiang* appears in the clause, an object *wh*-word must follow the modal and cannot move to its left. This leaves the *wh*-word in third position in the clause.

(14) 我 將 何 求？
(Wo jiang he qiu?)
(‘What will I ask for?’)

In contrast, when we examine a language which uncontroversially has second position clitics, we see that the clitics are in fact required to dislocate in cases like (14) so that they surface in second position in the clause. I illustrate this with examples from Seediq4, an Austronesian language spoken in Taiwan. Like many Formosan and Philippine languages, the language has second position clitic pronouns. Basic word order is VOS, as shown in (15a), with the full NP subject in clause-final position. If the subject is a clitic pronoun, however, it will attach to the first prosodic word in the tensed clause. In (15b), this is the main verb. In (15c), the main verb is preceded by a tense auxiliary, and the clitic moves up to attach to the auxiliary.

(15) a. Mari patis Ape.
(buy books Ape
‘Ape buys books.’
)

b. Mari=ku patis.
(buy=I book
‘I buy books.’
)

c. Wada=ku mari patis.
(Perf=I buy book
‘I bought books.’
)

Returning to Archaic Chinese, (16) shows subject *wh*-words in clause-initial position. Aldridge (2010) argues that subjects in Archaic Chinese underwent A-movement to

---

4 The Seediq data cited in this paper are taken from the author’s own field notes.
[Spec, TP]. Consequently, subject wh-phrases were not in the c-command domain of the focus probe on v triggering wh-movement to the edge of vP. This proposal is supported by additional evidence from Wei (1999) that subject wh-phrases occupied a position higher than object wh-phrases, which Aldridge proposes is in-situ in [Spec, TP]. In the examples in (16), we see subject wh-words in initial position in the clause. Note that the subject wh-word in (16a) precedes the modal which the object wh-word follows in (14).

(16) a. 誰 將 治 之?  
Shei jiang zhi zhi?  
who will govern them  
‘Who will govern them?’

b. 誰 能 出 不 由 戶?  
Shei neng chu bu you hu?  
who can exit not from door  
‘Who can exit other than through the door?’

Note further that Shi and Xu’s (2001) analysis cannot be salvaged by claiming that shei ‘who’ does not exhibit the clitic behavior that he ‘what’ does. Like he, shei also undergoes wh-movement when it is base merged in a position c-commanded by v, as seen above in (1b), (5), (6), and (12).

One final weakness for both Shi and Xu (2001) and Feng (1996), is that since cliticization targets prosodically weak elements, we do not expect these constituents to be focused. Returning to Seediq, this language has strong pronouns in addition to the weak clitics. The strong pronouns appear in argument positions in a declarative clause. For the subject, this is clause-final position, as in (17a). Note that the subject is also resumed by a clitic, which functions as an agreement marker. The strong pronoun can also be fronted to clause-initial position for focus, as in (17b). However, a clitic cannot be focused in this way, as in (17c).

(17) a. Wada=ku mari patis yaku  
Perf=I buy book I  
‘I bought books.’

b. Yaku wada mari patis.  
I Perf buy book  
‘It was I who bought books.’

c. *Ku wada mari patis.  
I Perf buy book  
‘It was I who bought books.’
This subsection has presented additional evidence for the syntactic analysis of Archaic Chinese \textit{wh}-movement by arguing that these cannot be analyzed as second position clitics.

2.3. SYNTACTIC MOVEMENT $\Rightarrow$ CLITICIZATION: \textit{WH-MOVEMENT}

A cliticization analysis of Archaic Chinese \textit{wh}-movement is also severely challenged by the change which took place between Archaic and early Middle Chinese. In this subsection, I show that syntactic \textit{wh}-movement was reanalyzed as cliticization in the Han period (2$^{nd}$ century BCE). Thus, \textit{wh}-questions in this period had noticeably different properties from those of the Archaic period examined in the preceding two subsections.

Early in the Han period, movement of phrasal \textit{wh}-constituents was lost, as shown in (18b). In contrast, monosyllabic \textit{wh}-words continued to undergo fronting, as in (18a). This asymmetry was noticed by Feng (1996) and is correctly predicted by his cliticization analysis.

(18) a. 子 將 何 欲？ (Shiji 86)
\begin{tabular}{l}
子 &  \textbf{将} & 何 & 欲？ \\
Zi & \textbf{jiang} & he & [VP yu \textit{tue}]? \\
You & Mod & what & want \\
‘What do you want?’
\end{tabular}

b. 此 固 其 理 也， 有 何 怨 乎？
\begin{tabular}{l}
此 & 固 & 其 & 理 & 也， & 有 & 何 & 怨 & 乎？ \\
Ci & gu & qi & li & ye, & [VP \textit{you} he \textit{yuan}] & hu? & \\
this & Adv & Dem & way & Decl & have & what & complaint & Q \\
‘This is the way things are; what complaint could you have?’ (Shiji 81)
\end{tabular}

\textit{Wh}-fronting was lost from a PP, which is also predicted by Feng’s analysis that clitics were hosted by verbs and not other categories.

(19) 陛下 與 誰 取 天下 乎？ (Shiji 55)
\begin{tabular}{l}
陛 & 下 & 與 & 誰 & 取 & 天下 & 乎？ \\
Bixia & yu & shei & qu & tianxia & hu? & \\
sire & with & who & conquer & world & Q \\
‘Sire, with whom will you conquer the world?’
\end{tabular}

Long distance fronting was also lost in the Han period. What is observed instead is movement within the embedded clause. Again, this is predicted by Feng’s analysis, assuming that the \textit{wh}-word attaches within the VP where it is base-generated.

(20) a. 諸 君 欲 誰 立？ (Shiji 43)
\begin{tabular}{l}
諸 & 君 & 欲 & 誰 & 立？ \\
Zhu & jun & yu & \textbf{shei} & li \textit{___}]? & \\
all & gentleman & want & who & stand \\
‘Gentlemen, who do you want to place (on the throne)?’
\end{tabular}
I suggest here that Feng’s (1996) cliticization analysis of *wh*-fronting be applied to the innovated process which emerged in the Han period. The fact that Feng’s analysis correctly accounts for the Han period phenomenon, however, also serves to emphasize the inappropriateness of this approach in accounting for the very different type of *wh*-movement in the preceding period.

To summarize the discussion in section 2, I have established that the preverbal positioning of Archaic Chinese *wh*-words does not constitute evidence for base-generated OV word order, since the position for pre-verbal *wh*-phrases is not the complement of the verb selecting this constituent. I have also shown that *wh*-fronting in Archaic Chinese was not cliticization, since this movement was not limited to prosodically weak elements, was not associated with a specific host such as the verb, and did not target a particular prosodic position, i.e. second position, in the clause. Finally, I have shown that the cliticization analysis of Archaic Chinese *wh*-movement is further damaged by the change from syntactic *wh*-movement to cliticization that takes place in the Han period. I therefore maintain Aldridge’s (2010) analysis that preverbal *wh*-phrases in pre-Han Archaic Chinese achieved their position via syntactic focus movement.

3. PREVERBAL NPS AND IDENTIFICATION FOCUS

The other type of pre-verbal object which I examine in this paper is the fronting of full NPs to the left of the light verb YI. The examples from section 1 are repeated below. (21a) shows the NP following YI. (21b) shows NPs preceding YI. Let me point out in passing here that (21b) 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.

(21) a. 所謂大 臣 者，以道 事 君。
    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.’  
    (Analects 11)

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 (22) summarizes the occurrences of YI with post- and pre-verbal NPs in the first eleven\textsuperscript{5} chapters of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century BCE text \textit{Zuozhuan}. Post-verbal NPs make up the overwhelming majority.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Zuozhuan (Yin-Ding)}
\end{center}

\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\textbf{YI NP:} & 841 (70\%) & \textbf{NP YI:} & 368 (30\%) \\
\textbf{YI NP VP} & 637 (53\%) & \textbf{V (NP) YI NP} & 204 (17\%) \\
\end{tabular}

Of the pre-verbal NPs, a significant number are \textit{wh}-words. Given that the language had \textit{wh}\textsuperscript{-}movement, as argued in section 2, these examples pose no problem for the current proposal that pre-verbal objects achieved their position through movement.

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. 失 忠 與 敬，何 以 事 君？
\begin{center}
Shi zhong yu jing, \textit{he yi} shi jun?
\end{center}
\begin{center}
lose loyalty and respect what YI serve lord
\end{center}
\begin{center}
‘Having lost loyalty and respect, what does one serve his lord with?’
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{(Zuozhuan, Xi 5)}
\end{center}

\item b. 吾 何 以 堪 之？
\begin{center}
Wu \textit{he yi} kan zhi?
\end{center}
\begin{center}
1 what YI rate 3.\text{Obj}
\end{center}
\begin{center}
‘How do I rate such treatment?’
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{(Zuozhuan, Xi 30)}
\end{center}
\end{enumerate}

The largest number of fronting cases involves the demonstrative pronoun \textit{shi}. \textit{Shi} is fronted in all but one of the examples I have found in the \textit{Zuozhuan} involving \textit{shi} and YI.

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. 夫 名 以 制 義，義 以 出 禮，
\begin{center}
Fu \textit{ming yi} zhi yi, \textit{yi yi} chu li,
\end{center}
\begin{center}
Dem name YI set right right YI emerge rites
\end{center}
\begin{center}
‘With a name, (a ruler) determines the codes of righteousness; from righteousness the rites of proper conduct emerge; the rites determine the form
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textit{(Zuozhuan, Xi 30)}
\end{center}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{5} There are only twelve chapters in the \textit{Zuozhuan}, so this chart very nearly reflects the entire text.
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.’ (Zuozhuan, 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
‘(He) lacks both virtuous government and an imposing penal code. This is what has led to evil.’

Recall from section 1 that Wang (1958), Feng (1996), Xu (2006), and others have noted that pre-verbal objects in Archaic 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 (24). In (24b), for example, shi refers to the lack of good government and a strong penal code introduced in the immediately preceding context. It is also clear that shi is focused, serving to exhaustively identify this antecedent as the subject of the following predicate. This exhaustivity is characteristic of the particular type of focus that Kiss (1998) terms identificational focus.

Two fundamental characteristics of identificational focus are that it requires movement and is exhaustive. Kiss contrasts this with information focus, which does not require movement and need not be exhaustive. In (25b), for example, the focused constituent remains in situ and the interpretation is not exhaustive. In the identificational focus example in (25c), on the other hand, the focused constituent moves to a focus position in the CP layer. The interpretation is also exhaustive.

Hungarian (Kiss 1998:249-250)

(25) a. Hol jartal a nyaron?
where went.you the summer.in
‘Where did you go in the summer?’

b. Jartam OLASZORSZAGBAN. (Information Focus)
went.I Italy.to
‘I went TO ITALY [among other places].’

c. Olaszorszagban jartam. (Identificational Focus)
Italy.to went.I
‘It was Italy where I went. (and nowhere else)’
(26) provides evidence for the analysis of NP fronting in Archaic Chinese as involving identificational focus. In both examples, the NP preceding YI is offered as the only option available. This is particularly clear in (26a), since it is stated in the preceding clause that the lords have nowhere else to turn. Then their only option is to depend on the Rites.

(26)  
(a) 臣聞諸侯無歸，
Chen wen zhuhou wu gui,
I hear lords not have return
禮以為歸。
li yi wei gui.  
Rites YI Cop return
‘I hear that when the lords have nothing else to turn to, it is to the Rites that they turn.’

(b) 何以事君？
He yi shi jun?
what YI serve lord
穆子曰：吾以事君也。
Muzi yue: Wu yi shi jun ye.
Muzi say I YI serve lord Nom
‘With what do you serve our lord? Muzi said, “It is with myself that I serve our lord.”’

(Kiss additionally points out that identificational focus is compatible with a contrastive interpretation. This is also true in Archaic Chinese. NP fronting with YI is very frequently found in parallel constructions which are in turn employed to express contrastive focus. In (27a), for example, the purposes of governance and a penal code are being contrasted with each other.

(27)  
(a) 君子謂
Junzi wei
good man say
鄭莊公失政刑矣。
Zheng Zhuang gong shi zheng xing yi.
Zheng Zhuang lord lose govt. penalty Asp
政以治民，
Zheng yi zhi min,
govt. YI govern people

刑 以 正 邪。

Superior men say that Lord Zhuang of Zheng has misplaced the concept of good government and a penal code. Government is used to govern the people; a penal code is used to correct evil.'  

(Zuozhuan, Yin 11)

楚 國 方城 以 為 城，

Chu state Fangcheng YI be wall

楚 水 以 为 池。

Han river YI be moat

‘The Chu will use Mt. Fangcheng as their castle wall and the River Han as their moat.’

(28) provides additional evidence of contrastive focus. While hunting, the Lord Tian of Qi tries to summon the gamekeeper by waving his bow, but the gamekeeper does not respond, as stated in (28a). The gamekeeper explains that different signals should be used to summon different people. This contrast is stated in (28b). NP-YI is used to express each of them. A flag is used to summon an official, a bow for a gentleman, and a leather cap for the gamekeeper. Not only is a contrast evidence among these three cases, but there is also a sense of exhaustivity. Since the gamekeeper did not see a leather cap, he did not approach. In other words, it is only with a leather cap that a gamekeeper can be summoned.

a. 齊侯 田 于 沛，招 虞人 以 弓，不 進。

Qi Lord hunt in Pei call gamekeeper use bow not come

‘When the lord of Qi went hunting in Pei, he summoned the gamekeeper using his bow, but he did not come.’  

(Zuozhuan, Zhao 20)

b. 舊 我 先 君 之 田 也，

past 1 former lord Gen hunt Nom

旃 以 招 大夫， 弓 以 招 士，

flag YI call official bow use call gentleman
ALDRIDGE: FOCUS AND ARCHAIC CHINESE

\textit{pi} guan \textit{yi} zhao yuren. \textit{(Zuozhuan}, Zhao 20)

‘In the past, when our former lord went hunting, (he) summoned top official with flag, a gentleman in his employ with a bow, and the gamekeeper with a leather cap.’

c. \textit{Chen bu jian pi guan, gu bu gan jin.}

I not see leather cap, so not dare approach

‘I did not see a leather cap, so (I) did not dare to approach.’

Kiss (1998) further points out that identificational focus is incompatible with universal quantification. A universal quantifier can receive informational focus, as in (29a). But this is not possible with identificational focus, which is conveyed with a cleft construction in English, as in (29b).

\textbf{English} (Kiss 1998:253)

(29) a. Mary invited \underline{everybody}. \hspace{1cm} (Information focus OK)

b. *It was everybody that Mary invited. \hspace{1cm} (Identificational focus out)

There is indirect evidence that the same restriction holds in Archaic Chinese. Universal quantification is expressed in Archaic Chinese by means of a preverbal quantifier which quantifies over the VP. The NP selected by YI can be universally quantified, but all examples I have found involve postverbal YI. This suggests, at least indirectly, that fronting is incompatible with universal quantification, as is expected if fronting the NP results in identificational focus.

(30) a. \textit{Gong zhi zhi, jin [yi bao] xing.}

lord know 3.Obj all YI treasure go

‘The lord learned of it and left with all the treasure.’

b. \textit{Jin [yi qi bao] ci zuoyou.}

all YI 3.Gen treasure bestow retainers

‘(He) bestowed all of the treasure on his retainers.’

From the discussion in this section, we can conclude that pre-verbal objects were not base-generated in their surface positions. NP-fronting was motivated by a specific information structure-related trigger, i.e. identificational focus, which has been cross-linguistically demonstrated to require movement.
4. CONCLUSION
The main purpose of this paper has been to show that preverbal objects in Archaic Chinese do not offer evidence for base-generated OV word order but must rather be analyzed as having undergone syntactic movement. I focused in this paper on wh-fronting and NP fronting with the light verb YI. Secondarily, I have argued that movement in these cases was a type of focus movement.
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