

# The Changes of the Historical Grammar of the Chinese Language during the 3<sup>rd</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> Centuries\*

*Isabella Samoilovna Gurevich*

## Introductory notes

### 1. The Aim of Research

Generally, research of the kind reported below must follow closely the entire process of grammatical developments in a language, from the moment they originated until their state in the modern language. This needs a close analysis of an extensive source material, with a detailed description of language parameters from the greatest possible number of texts, with the descriptions arranged chronologically.

### 2. Selection of Source-material

When starting research on the history of a language – and Chinese is undoubtedly no exception – the linguist must first tackle the problem of selecting the source material, since the wider and the more accurate the coverage of a period with relevant texts, the more exact and thorough the description of the language of that particular period. Grammatical works on Medieval Chinese have been made in this country on the basis of the *xiaoshuo* genre;<sup>1</sup> it is therefore natural that the sources, mainly of the Liuchao and Tang periods, should be other texts that are generally considered to be, if roughly, not the *xiaoshuo* genre of the period.<sup>2</sup> The sources for the Song-Yuan time are mainly from folk prose, *pinghua* (平話).

In addition to the *pinghua* texts, colloquial source-material of great importance of the Northern Song time used; it is a twelfth-century manuscript by Xu Mengxin.

---

\* I consider myself fortunate in receiving high skill computer guidance of my colleague Viacheslav Zaytsev. Without his assistance the final copy would not have been possible. The paper draws on research supported by the CHIANG CHING-KUO FOUNDATION, Project Number: RG005-EU-07 and by the Russian Foundation for Humanistic Studies, grant 08-04-00260a

### 3. The Composition of the Paper

The essay consists of three parts: 1) Chinese grammar of the Liuchao period (3<sup>rd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> cc A.D., to be precise); 2) characteristics of Chinese grammar of the Tang Dynasty; 3) changes in Chinese grammatical structures that occurred during the Song-Yuan period.<sup>3</sup>

Studies on the grammar of each of the three period have been based on different kind of texts; the language material for the Liuchao period is nearly all restricted to translations of Buddhist texts into Chinese; the source-material for the Tang period is based on Buddhist *yulu* of the *dhyāna* school; as for the Song-Yuan period, the main source-material is of the *pinghua* genre – tales about historical events recited by the street story-tellers. In addition to *pinghua*, the above-mentioned twelfth-century vernacular literature (*San Chao bei meng hui bian* 三朝北盟會編) provides material on the colloquial language of the period: it is in fact a collection of various documents on the history of diplomatic relations between Song China and the Jin State during the period 1117–1162 (for more details see below).

#### Chinese of the Liuchao Period

The language of the 3<sup>rd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> cc period was scrupulously described in an earlier work in Russian.<sup>4</sup> Without dwelling on different opinions regarding time boundaries in the history of the Chinese language, or the principles defining them, we shall name one feature common to all historians of the Chinese language: they all avoid making any reference to the period between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and the 5<sup>th</sup> centuries A.D.; condescendingly referred to as a “period of transition”.<sup>5</sup>

##### 1. What is the Language of a Transitional Period?

When the language of a certain period is called transitional it means that, on the one hand, the grammatical patterns of the language maintain some of the features that were formerly characteristic of an earlier period while, on the other hand, the new grammatical standards that have already manifested themselves will be firmly established at a later date. A transitional language does not demonstrate any distinctive features of its own i.e. such features that would make it different from the languages of both the preceding historical period and of the one directly following.

In the case under consideration, the language of the 3<sup>rd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> cc period should not have any special grammatical features that did not exist in Classical Chinese, on one side, and in Medieval Chinese on the other. Meanwhile, a number of new function words, as well as new grammatical patterns, manifested themselves in the period under study, which is of great interest for the linguist and requires research in order to prove that the period in question became an independent stage in the process of forming the historical grammar of the Chinese language.

The research resulted in the following: along with the grammatical features common to Classical Chinese and those that were standard in Medieval Chinese, the language of the 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> cc had certain features that distinguished it from the two above-mentioned forms of Chinese.<sup>6</sup>

Some grammatical characteristics of Classical Chinese have continued, practically unchanged, such as the demonstrative pronouns 者 *zhe* “he who” and 所 *suo* “which”; the chief prepositions of Classical Chinese continue to be widely used, such as 以 *yi* introducing the instrument of action or the direct object, 爲 *wei* “for,” 與 *yu* “with,” etc. Verbal constructions with time modifiers preceding the verb also continue to be used.

At the same time, new grammatical patterns emerge during the period in question, but they do not occur with regularity. Their regular usage is registered in Medieval Chinese. This includes the use of nominal clauses with the conjunctive 是 *shi*. It is well known that 是 as a conjunction was hardly ever used in Classical Chinese, while in the period under study this pattern is frequently used; however, the conjunction cannot be considered an absolutely compulsory part of the nominal clause. In addition to conjunctive patterns, sentences may be formed by directly attaching the verb to the noun, as well as by using the morphemes 爲 *wei*, 乃 *nai* and some others that function similarly to the conjunction.

In the period studied, a new meaning was acquired by the pronoun 他 *ta* which, in Classical Chinese, had been a real demonstrative pronoun meaning “another.” In the language of the period under study, 他 was slowly transformed from a demonstrative pronoun into a personal pronoun, third person singular, so that in the texts of the period 他 has a “transitional” meaning: it is no longer demonstrative, nor has it become a proper personal pronoun. At this stage, 他 means an indefinite person and is translated into Russian as “someone,” “some person” – when used independently; it means “someone else’s” (belonging to another person) when attached to a noun.

The formation of complex verbs was a process of great intensity during the period under study. It is known that in Classical Chinese no complex verbs existed in which the two components signified “an action” and “the result of the action,” respectively. This was because the two verbal morphemes – the first one signifying the action itself and the second one indicating the result of the action – were always joined by the conjunction 而 *er*. It should be noted that the complex verbs of the 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> cc period differ from those in Modern Chinese as it was easily possible to break them into two words that were formally independent.

Another new development that occurred in the syntax of the period was the use of numeration constructions, or expressions containing quantifiers; however, the use of a quantifier in the numerical expression was far from compulsory, since the old construction continued to be used, in which the numeral was directly attached to the noun.

Thus, some grammatical structures were inherited from Classical Chinese completely unchanged while others appeared in the language during the period

under study to become regular features at a later time – in Medieval Chinese. In other words, these grammatical phenomena characterize the language of the period as transitional.

## 2. Language of the Liuchao Period as an Independent Stage in the History of Chinese

In addition to various features characteristic of the language in the transitional period, a number of grammatical patterns should be noted which are distinctive of the period under study. For instance, the time modifiers preceding the verb are arranged in a way peculiar to the language of the Liuchao period. The unit indicating the past tense is the morpheme 曾 *ceng* that replaces the classic Chinese 嘗 *chang*. The perfect tenses have the morpheme 已 *yi* preceding the verb. The future tense is indicated by the morpheme 當 *dang* instead of the classical Chinese 將 *jiang* (it should be noted that the use of 當 instead of 將 was a complicated process rather than a mere substitution of one function morpheme by another one). No such system of tense modifiers preceding the verb existed in the earlier forms of Chinese, although some verbal modifiers did (e.g. 曾 is sufficiently frequent in Medieval Chinese); the disintegration was due to the appearance of verbal suffixes.

Of particular interest are some adverbs and prepositions that do not occur either before or after the period under study. For example, the adverb 都 *du* is not to be found in Classical Chinese; in Medieval Chinese and in Modern Chinese it has the meaning of a generalizing word placed in front of the predicate while in the language of the period under study it is usually placed before the negation (無 *wu* or, less frequently, 不 *bu*) and has the meaning of “by no means; absolutely not.” The adverb 但 *dan* mean “just; just then,” which only exists in the language of the period under study and cannot be found in the language in any other period of the history of the Chinese language, is common both in Classical and Medieval Chinese. The preposition 從 *cong* besides the ordinary sense (such as a starting point or the beginning of an action) has a specific sense – it introduces an object meaning a person. This sense of 從 is only characteristic of the Liuchao period.

In the period under study, syntactic peculiarities of the language are also notable: questions are constructed by placing the morpheme 不 at the end of a sentence, while in Classical Chinese interrogative sentences are formed with the particle 嗎 *ma*. The causative construction uses the function word 令 *ling* (instead of the older 使 *shi*). Conditional clauses are constructed by placing the morpheme 者 *zhe* at the end of a clause, which differs from the situation both before and after the period under study, where the conjunction 若 *ruo* is used to introduce the subordinate clause.

The above instances of specific grammatical patterns should be sufficient to demonstrate that the language of the Liuchao period is different from both its predecessor (Classical Chinese) and its successor (Medieval Chinese).

## The Language of the Tang Dynasty Epoch

### 1. Textual Sources

Chinese grammar of the Tang Dynasty is dealt with in a number of works devoted to the subject, all based on the texts written in different genres.<sup>7</sup> From the point of view of their language, the genres of the Tang prose vary considerably. In the language of *guwen* and the Tang Dynasty short story, the function words of Classical Chinese are used almost exclusively, while the language of the Dunhuang *bianwen* demonstrates the function words from both Classical Chinese and the new colloquial language of the Tang epoch. This was indisputably proved by S.E. Yakhontov, who drew his conclusions from a close analysis based on statistical data.<sup>8</sup>

### 2. The Tang Dynasty Chan-Buddhist *yulu* as a Basic Textual Source-material

As the Chan-Buddhist *yulu* of the Tang Dynasty have not been included in S.E. Yakhontov's research (he carefully explains his decision), there was a great need for a detailed examination of the *yulu*, since their language is very close to the colloquial language of the Tang language of the Tang period.

Why are the *yulu* texts so colloquial? In the mid-eighth century, with the main Buddhist schools in the capital cities fading away, the apologists of Chan-Buddhism had to move to the "provincial" regions in the South and East; their aim was to attract large audiences of common people and, consequently, made their talks and sermons acceptable for those who were not well versed in Buddhism. They rendered profound notions in images from every day life, in a language understandable to all. Talks and sermons by the famous masters were jotted down word for word in the Chan-Buddhism tradition, and thus became *yulu*. That is how the best samples of the old colloquial language came down to us in their original form.

The author of this essay has been studying the subject of the Tang Dynasty Chan-Buddhist *yulu* as the main textual source for some time;<sup>9</sup> the reader is referred to some works that, hopefully, may be of interest.<sup>10</sup>

The basic principle for describing the peculiar grammatical patterns found in the above-mentioned *yulu* texts is to compare, whenever possible, with both the language of an earlier period (3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> cc A.D.) and with the Tang Dynasty *bianwen*.<sup>11</sup> Comparison with the latter is of particular importance as it allows us to estimate the respective percentage of old and new grammatical patterns in both cases, which, in its turn, allows us to come to the conclusion that **the Tang Dynasty Chan-Buddhist *yulu* can be called the truly representative texts with regard to the colloquial language of the period.**

## 3. The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch

This Sutra as an Immediate Predecessor of the Main Source. Chronologically, the Sutra text (hereafter, the PSSP) is an immediate predecessor of the *yulu* texts, so an analysis of the former will help to demonstrate the very process of forming the grammatical shape of the latter (see also note 9).

Briefly, the grammatical characteristics of the PSSP are follows:

As regards **noun inflections**, the suffix 子 *zi* is actually absent; the morpheme 人 *ren* is frequently used to form new nouns, which is also characteristic of classical Chinese and of the Liuchao period; there is a single occurrence of the prefix 老 *lao* (老母 *laomu* “mother”); plurality can be indicated by 等 *deng* or 眾 *zhong* (the latter is placed either before or after the noun). With regard to the **pronouns**, the pronouns 我 *wo* and 吾 *wu* are used for the first person, both without syntactical distribution; the pronoun 汝 *ru* for the second person, which was characteristic of the Liuchao period. But there is no occurrence of the Modern Chinese 你 *ni*; all the pronouns listed above have 等 *deng* added to indicate the plural form. As for the third person, the old 之 *zhi* is used to signify the object. The pronoun 他 *ta*, which is common in the ninth century *yulu* (hereafter referred to as “other *yulu*” or “ripe *yulu*”), is not found in the PSSP in the function of a personal pronoun, though it does occur in the old sense (“other,” “another”): 他佛 *ta fo* “another Buddha” (§ 23). There are no occurrences of the pronouns 伊 *yi* and 渠 *qu* which signify the third person in other *yulu*.

Interrogative sentences about persons employ 誰 *shui*, 阿誰 *ashui*, and 何人 *heren* (“who?”); impersonal questions contain various combinations with 何 *he*. 誰能得智? (§ 37) *Shui neng de zhi?* “Who could know?” 更有阿誰? (§ 48) *Geng you ashui?* “And who else was?” 汝何方人? (§ 3) *Ru hefang ren?* “Where are from?” “What land do you come from?” However, 什麼 *shenma* has not been registered, though it is quite usual for other *yulu*. In one case, 誰 is used in the sense of “which one” (in similar cases, Classical Chinese uses 孰 *shu*, while other *yulu* use 那 *na*): ……看惠能見解與吾誰疾遲 (§ 40) ... *kan Huineng jianjie yu wu shui ji chi...* “let us compare the look of Huineng and mine: **which** is swifter [in comprehending] and which is slower”. The interrogative pronoun “what?” is rendered by the combinations 何物 *hewu*, 何等 *hedeng*, 何事 *heshi*; the interrogative adverb “where?” – by 何處 *hechu*; the interrogatives “how?”, “why, what for?” – by 何以 *heyi*, 何須 *hexu*: 依法當付何人? (§ 49) *yi fa dang fu heren?* “whom will you hand your vestments and the dharma?”; 無者無何事念者何物? (§ 17) *Wu-zhe wu heshi nian-zhe hewu?* “No” means no **what**, “think” means think of **what?**; 何須更願往生? *Hexu geng yuan wang sheng?* “Why wish to be reborn?” The above combinations with 何 are found in other *yulu*, too, but less frequently than in the PSSP, as a new structure is used instead, i.e. 什(甚)麼 *shenma*.

The **predicative substitute** is the same as was common in the preceding period, i.e. 如何 *ruhe*; there is no occurrence of the new predicative substitutes that are usual for the other *yulu* – 作麼生 *zuomasheng*, 興麼 *yuma*, etc. Regarding the

**demonstrative pronouns**, 彼 *bi* and 此 *ci* are used, which are characteristic of the preceding period; not once does the new 這 *zhe* occur, although it is usual for other *yulu*. With reference to the **reflexive pronouns**, the morpheme 自 *zi* is observed (the old forms 己 *ji* and 身 *shen*, though used in the language of the preceding period, are not registered in the PSSP), with some special features in the grammatical pattern; for instance, 自 can act as a normal determiner and in apposition: 我自法門 ..... (§ 17) *wo zi fa men...* “My **own** theory of dharma...” There is one occurrence of the disyllabic 自家 *zija*, which is characteristic of the *yulu*: 但願自家修清淨 (§ 36) *Dan yuan zija xiu qingjing* “I only want you **yourselves** to practice clarity. The **distributive pronouns**: the isolated 各 *ge* and its reduplication 各各 *gege*, both meaning “each one”: 衆生各各自度。 (§ 21) *Zhongsheng gege zi du*. “**Each** living being saves itself”. In the text under discussion, there are several **classifiers**, such as 首 *shou* to count the verse and 間 *jian* to count rooms: 有三間房廊 (§ 5) *you sanjian fanglang* “There were three (**compartment**) in the corridor” (these words are sufficiently frequent in the language of the preceding period); the classifier 箇 *ge* is undoubtedly a novel element registered twice in the PSSP, although with the same word: 八箇餘月 *bage yu yue* “more than eight months”. In general, the classifiers occur in this text only occasionally, as in most cases the numeral is directly attached to the noun.

With regard to the **function words related to the verb**, the modifier 當, indicating the future tense and obligation, is quite common in the Liuchao period language: 當付汝衣法。 (§ 7) *Dang fu ru yi fa*. “I **will hand** to you my vestments and the Dharma”; 當令自悟。 (§ 9) *Dan ling zi wu*. “You **must** act so that [people] would recover their sight themselves.” There are occurrences of the morpheme 了 *liao* (a function unit that is common for other *yulu*): 法即付了。 (§ 49) *Fa ji fu liao*. “The Dharma I **have entrusted**”; 畫人盧珍看壁了, 明日下手。 (§ 5) *Huaren lu zhen kan bi liao, mingri xia shou*. “The painter Lu Zhen **examined the wall** and started working the following day.”

A form characteristic of *yulu* is used in the PSSP with the meaning indicating the impossibility of an action, which is formed by putting 不得 *bude* after the verbal predicate: ..... 數日作不得。 (§ 7) ... *shu ri zuo bude* “...several days [he] **was unable** to write [verse]”; 代汝迷不得。 (§ 44) *Dai ru mi bude*. “Instead of you, **I cannot** be exposed to delusions.”

Along with the **adverbs** common to the language of the preceding period (such as the imperative 且 *qie*, 但 *dan* “only,” 更 *geng* “still,” etc), new adverbs occur, which are usual for other *yulu*: 原來 *yuanlai* “it turns out,” 實是 *shishi* “in fact,” 只 *zhi* and the disyllabic 只是 *zhishi* “only.”

Similarly to the language of the preceding period, the function words 持 *chi* and 將 *jiang* are used as preposition, but we do not find 把 *ba*, which is usual for other *yulu* and continues to be used in Modern Chinese: 從何處來, 持此經典? (§ 2) *Cong hechu lai, chi ci jingdian?* “Where did you come from **with** this canon?”

As regards the localizers, the old 內 *nei* “inside” should be mentioned as being registered in the PSSP; the new localizer with the same meaning, 裏 *li*, does not

occur in the text under consideration, although it is characteristic of other *yulu*: .....於堂內..... (§ 7)... *yu tang-nei*... “...in the Hall [for sermons]...”

Along with the old ways of **indicating a question** (such as placing 否 *fou* and other negatives at the end of an interrogative sentence), the question can be expressed by repeating the verbal predicate in the affirmative and the negative forms: 吾打汝痛不痛? (§ 44) *Wu da ru tong bu tong?* “When I beat you, does it hurt or not?”

**Copulatives in clauses** may be in older forms (such as the old negative copula 非 *fei*) and new – such as 不是 *bu shi* which is regular in other *yulu*.

**Other function words** include important localizers 處 *chu*, 邊 *bian* (also found in the Tang *bianwen*): 汝今向吾邊 (§ 3) *Ru jin xiang wu-bian* “You are now bending your steps **to me**”.

Classical demonstrative 之 *zhi* is used as a marker of the attributive, while other *yulu* make use, in this function, of both 底 *di* and the modern form 的 *de*.

On the whole, the analysis of some characteristic features of the PSSP allows us to say that, on the one hand, its language is close to that of the pre-Tang period or, in other words, to the colloquial language of the Liuchao period but on the other hand, the PSSP text reveals the number of grammatical elements that are characteristic of the language of the Tang Dynasty Dunhuang *bianwen* or, in some cases, of the “ripe” *yulu* language.

The above analysis of grammatical features of the PSSP allows us to suggest that, even without knowing the historical background of having it in written form, it is highly probable that the language of the PSSP is close to the vernacular of the 7<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> cc A.D. Consequently, as the earliest sample of the *yulu* genre, it is an immediate predecessor of the vernacular used in writing down the Chan-Buddhist *yulu* of the Tang epoch, which is our main source for studying and describing the Tang language as a whole.

#### 4. On the Language of the “Ripe” *yulu*

The “ripe” *yulu* have been chosen as the main literary source for this research. On giving an opinion on the grammatical features of the “ripe” *yulu*, it is natural to concentrate on the analysis of certain function words, semi-function words and some specific grammar structures.

As regards the **function units preceding the noun**, certain aspects should be noted. The language of the *yulu* (this refers to nearly all texts used for this work, with the natural exception of the PSSP) demonstrates an extremely frequent use of nouns inflected with suffixes, which is especially noticeable in the *Linji lu* and the *Pang jushi yulu*.

Most frequently used is the suffix 子 *zi*, with the suffix 頭 *tou* taking second place. The text of *The Grotto of the Playful Hermit* (*You xian ku* 游仙窟) has an especially large proportion of nouns with the suffix 子. It should be mentioned, however, that a considerable number of such nouns are entered in dictionaries in their non-inflected form.<sup>12</sup> The suffix 頭, originating in the Liuchao period, becomes widely used in the

Tang Dynasty time. Also used in the Tang epoch are the suffix 子, and later – the suffix 兒 *er*. The morpheme 漢 *han* is used as a word-formative element to create new words which are mostly vulgarisms.

The morpheme 人 is used permanently – in the Liuchao period, in Classical Chinese, in the texts under consideration. The morpheme 處 *chu* occurs as a noun suffix with an abstract sense.

Of the function units preceding the noun, two prefixes occur in the texts under study: 老 *lao*- and 阿 *a*-, with the former originating from an adjective “old”, due to a gradual loss of the significant sense and the latter more commonly used with the pronouns – it can be placed in front of a noun only occasionally.

With regard to **personal pronouns**, it should be noticed that, besides the usual – practically for all periods of the history of Chinese – form for the first person 我, there are occurrences of 某甲 *moujia* (not found in the *bianwen* texts).

As for the forms of politeness, which could replace first-person pronouns, only one such word, 朕 *zhen*, can be found in the PSSP. At the same time, in an additional source (*The Grotto of the Playful Hermit*), we encounter such polite forms for the first-person pronoun, or self-name, as 余 *yu*, 下官 *xiaguan*, 承 *cheng*, 僕 *pu*, 兒 *er*.

As to the second person pronouns, singular and plural, equally common in the texts under study are the pronouns 你 and 汝. The PSSP text is an exception, for it shows no occurrence of 你, although it appeared in the Tang Dynasty epoch.

The two personal pronouns mentioned above can have both singular and plural meaning, but the latter is usually formed by 等, a common marker of plurality.

Apart from the proper pronouns, the second-person meaning is also indicated by 子 and 公 *gong*. However, these words in the *yulu* texts seem to act as neutral substitutes for actual pronouns rather than as forms of politeness.

Of the third-person pronouns, the most prominent is 他, which eventually becomes a personal pronoun in the Tang Dynasty period, after pushing the old third-person pronouns 伊 and 渠 into a less important position.

In the texts under study, the pronoun 他 may have several senses: 1) similarly to the *bianwen* texts, it may signify an indefinite person (“someone”); provisionally, it could be named as “indefinite-personal;” 2) when replacing the actual name of a person, 他 is a proper personal pronoun (“he”, “they”) with various function in the sentence. This meaning of 他 is characteristic of all texts under consideration, with the exception of the PSSP; 3) finally, on several occasions 他 shows its old meaning from Classical Chinese – that of the demonstrative pronoun (“other,” “another”).

The pronoun 他 may be either singular or plural. No marker of plurality has been registered in the texts under consideration.

The old third-person pronouns 伊 and 渠 are found in practically every text, with a particularly great number of 渠 in *The Grotto of the Playful Hermit*.

Occasionally, the old pronouns are encountered in both texts selected for analysis and in the *bianwen* texts: for example, the pronoun 其 *qi* with the functions it used to have in Classical Chinese, i.e. those of a normal attribute or subject of a clause. There are very few example of 其 used as a demonstrative pronoun.

As regards the **reflexive pronouns**, the morpheme 自 is of special interest due to its semi-function properties; when compared with a corresponding group of fully significant words, it appears to act as a semi-function adverb, for-irrespective of its meaning – it is always placed before the verb, which makes it quite different from the reflexive pronoun 己 “self” which takes different positions in the sentence, depending on the differences in its functions. Nevertheless, due to function “resembling” the object, which is demonstrated by the morpheme 自 and which is impossible for the adverb, the morpheme 自 is placed in the group of adverbs with the pronominal meaning – and that allows us to consider it in this chapter.

The meanings of the morpheme 自 are many and various, with a number of senses that should be called indefinite. Thus, this morpheme may indicate that the object of an action is the same as its subject. If the verb following the morpheme 自 is in the negative, then the morpheme may be placed between the negative word and the verb, i.e. immediately before the predicate – unlike common adverbs that are placed before the predicate group. In addition to the reflexive sense (“self”), the morpheme 自 may mean “himself” in the texts selected for analysis – similarly to the language of the preceding historical period. If this is the case, then the verb following the morpheme keeps its object (if it has one), and this constitutes a formal difference between this meaning and the previous one.

The disyllabic reflexive 自己 *ziji* “himself” also occurs in the texts under study and continues to be used in Modern Chinese. It is encountered in different functions: the circumstance (which sometimes may be understood as the subject), the object, the apposition, the nominal part of the predicate. Another disyllabic 自家 is also encountered; it has the sense of the “self” and is thus synonymous with 自己.

As regards the **demonstrative pronouns**, it should be noted that, though both demonstratives – 這 *zhe* “this” and 那 *na* “that” – are found in the *yulu* texts and both continue existing in Modern Chinese, it is the former, i.e. 這 (者), that is found in the texts under study, with the exception of the PSSP. The latter demonstrative has mainly an interrogative meaning in the texts in question. The difference between the interrogative pronoun and the demonstrative pronoun, in their spoken forms, lies in their tones; the tone of demonstrative 那 corresponds to the fourth tone of modern standard Chinese while the tone of interrogative 那 corresponds to the third tone of the same system. Occasional examples with the demonstrative 那 are 那個 *nage* and 那邊 *nabian*.

The new demonstratives do not exclude the old ones from the texts under study: the pronouns 此 “this” and 彼 “that,” which are characteristic of the previous period continue to be used (with the latter one occurring considerably less frequently).

When defining groups of words that are able to function as substitutes, one finds a group that may be called the **pronominal predicate** (hereafter, pro-predicate). It is distinct from a similar pro-predicate in the older language, 然 *ran*, which had but one function – it could only be a predicate. In later periods, such words were able to function both as the predicate and as the attribute: this refers to the Liuchao period

with its 爾 *er*, 如此 *ruci*, 如是 *rushi* “thus,” “in the way,” “such.” The situation in our texts is similar: most such words can be both pro-predicate and pro-attribute (both nominal and predicative); thus, it appears right to group them together.

Correlated with the pro-predicate 如此 and 如是 are the interrogatives 如何 *ruhe* and 奈何 *naihe*. In spite of the older pro-predicates staying on in the language, the key role belongs to the new words appearing in that group, with most of them using the morpheme 麼 *ma*: 作麼生 *zuomasheng*, 作麼 *zuoma*, 與麼 *yuma*, 祇麼 *zhima*, 恁麼 *ren(rem)ma*; there are also other pro-predicates such as 爭 *zheng* and 這般 *zheban*. The above function words want a dual classification: 1) interrogative versus non-interrogative (see a chapter on interrogative pronouns below); 2) according to their functions.

Of the **non-interrogative pro-predicates**, the form 恁麼, typical for the Tang and Song *yulu*, corresponds to the later form 那麼. However, at the beginning of its life in the language, the said pro-predicate is also used in the sense of 這麼.<sup>13</sup> In a sentence, the form 恁麼 can function as a predicate, an attribute to the predicate, a marker of the attribute to the predicate. The meaning of 與麼 *yuma* may be expressed through 這麼 and 如此.<sup>14</sup>

The texts demonstratestrate many cases of 與麼 with the function of the verbal predicate; sometimes the predicate has the form of word-sentence. Among the demonstrative pro-predicates, some – such as (與麼, 祇麼) – are typical of the Tang Dynasty *yulu* only: they are not registered either in the preceding Liuchao period or in the subsequent Song-Yuan period. Nor do exist in Modern Chinese. Others (恁麼, 這般), though not typical of other Tang Dynasty texts, become regular features of the language in the Song-Yuan period.<sup>15</sup>

For **interrogative words** about human beings (“who?”), the texts under study usually employ 誰, 阿誰 and, less frequently, 什(甚)麼人 *shem (shen) maren*; there are single occurrences of 誰人 and of 誰家, 何人 as a possessive attribute (“whose?”). The interrogative 誰 is nearly always the subject, 阿誰 tends to be an object, but, in clauses of existence, it follows 有 *you* “there is” as the nominal part of the predicate.

There are two groups of interrogative words in the *yulu* texts for asking questions about inanimate objects: 1) common for the texts under study is the modern interrogative 什麼 that first appears in the language in the Tang Dynasty period (its other form, resulting from fusion, occurs less frequently), as well as 什麼物 *shenmawu*; the form 什麼 may be preceded by the classifier 個 *ge* (個什麼 *geshenma*); 2) occasional usage is observed of the old form 何 that is characteristic of the language of the Liuchao period, with several compound forms such as 何物 (“what”) and 何處 (more frequently, “where?”; occasionally – “what”).

The proportion of the interrogatives of the second group is negligible by comparison with the first group. Besides, a separate 何 only occurs in the function of nominal attribute “what?”, while in the Liuchao period it demonstrates the practice of being used in different functions. The meaning “what?” is indicated by 何物, which, unlike the separate 何 and the compound 何所 *hesuo*, is not placed before

the verb, but follows it – like the interrogative compound 何等 in the language of the Liuchao period.

Compounds with 什麼 and 何 act as attributes modifying either the predicate or its substitute. Thus, the meaning “why” is indicated by 緣何 *yuanhe* (note that an interrogative with the same sense, but with an inversion of word order, was common for the language of the Liuchao period) and – in a single case – by 緣什麼 *yuanshenma*. Other variants of compounds employing 緣 (this morpheme is used to express a cause as early as in the language of late Han period)<sup>16</sup> are used to form the interrogative “why?” in the *bianwen* texts.<sup>17</sup>

The forms 何故 *hegu*, 何須 *hexu* meaning “why?” “what for?” have been registered, as well as 爲什麼 *weishenma*, living on in Modern Chinese. The question relating to the place of action (“where?”) usually employs 什麼處 (甚處 *shenchu*); sometimes 什麼所在 *shenme suozai* occurs, too. The interrogative word may follow the preposition 向 *xiang*. The question “where?” may be asked by employing various compounds with an old interrogative word 何, such as 何方 *hefang*, 何在 *hezai*, 何由 *heyou*, etc. The same interrogative word is commonly included in questions relating to the cause and the method of an action: 何以 *heyi* “why?”, 以何 *yihe* “how?” etc, which precede the predicate and act as modifiers of the predicate or its substitute. Common to the language of the previous period, the interrogative 云何 *yunhe* “how?” “what for?” is also encountered in the language of the period under consideration. However, its usage in Tang Dynasty texts is different from that in the Liuchao texts, in which this interrogative precedes the verbal predicate. As regards our texts, this word can be the subject, or it can be placed before the subject, like an adverb referring to the whole sentence; the latter position has not yet been described in reference books on Chinese grammar (as far as I know)

In common with 云何, the **compound 如何** is placed at the very beginning of the sentence; it is followed by the conjunctive 是 and the nominal part of the predicate, which is either a noun or a complex predicative compound. Thus, 如何 is the formal subject, and the entire construction is an inversion, in which the nominal part of the predicate corresponds to the word with the sense of the subject, while the conjunction 是 has a stressing function.

Typical of, and frequently encountered in, the texts under analysis are the **new interrogatives with the sense of “how?”, “in what way?”, “why?”**, with all forms employing the particle 麼: 作麼生 (equivalent of the modern 怎麼 *zenma*), 作麼 *zuoma*, 作什麼 *zuoshenma*; another new interrogative word is 爭 *zheng*. Most frequent of the above-listed words is the interrogative 作麼生; it can be an actual pro-predicate or its modifier (in this case the sentence contains a significant verb). The interrogative 作麼 is found to perform the same functions as the interrogative 作麼生. The Tang Dynasty texts demonstrate a fairly frequent usage of the interrogative word 爭 “how?”, that is a modifier of the verbal predicate; in cases where the verbal predicate follows a modal verb, the modifier is placed before the modal verb.

The **interrogative word 那 “what?”** is found in the texts under consideration both as a separate word (single instances) and in compounds – 那個 *nage*, 阿那 *ana*,

阿那個 *anage* “which?”, “who?”; a separate 那 is registered as a modifier of the verbal predicate. The forms 那個, 阿那個 perform the function of a subject, both in a verbal and in a conjunctive sentences; the form 阿那 has the function of a modifier to the subject.

**Questions about quantity** (“how many?”, “how much?”) generally use 多少 *duoshao*, with other forms also possible: 幾 *ji*, 幾何 *jihe* and 幾許 *jixu*.

The word 許多 “so many” (corresponding to the modern 這麼多 *zhemaduo*) is either a nominal attribute or an object to the predicate in the texts under analysis. The same functions are typical for 許多 *xuduo* in Modern Standard Chinese.<sup>18</sup> The word 許多 (as well as the separate 多 *duo* “many”) can join the word 般 *ban*; 許多般 *xuduoban*, 多般 *duoban* mean “multiform”, “various”. The old word 數 *shu* “several” is usually encountered with nouns meaning a measure of time, such as 數日 *shu ri* “several days”, 數里 *shu li* “several li”, etc.<sup>19</sup>

The process of forming verbs and verbal compounds that started in the Han Dynasty period was widely represented in the Liuchao period, and continued to take place in the Tang Dynasty period. A common feature of the texts under consideration are the **verbal compounds** that are made up either of **synonymous morphemes** or of a **verbal root plus a modifier**.

As for the first category of verbal compounds, there is no difference between such verbs in the language of the Tang Dynasty period and similar compounds in the language of the preceding period. As for the second group employing modifiers, the most common ones – in common with the language of *bianwen* – are 取 *qu* “take” and 卻 *que* “give back”; 問取 *wenqu* (15, 118) “inquire”, 看取 *kanqu* (23) “look into”, 覓取 *miqu* (44) “find out”, 擔卻 *danque* “carry away” (70, 90).<sup>20</sup> In addition to 取 and 卻, other modifiers include 開 *kai* “open”, 住 *zhu* “stop”, 起 *qi* “start”, etc. The modifiers 來 *lai* and 去 *qu* are used to form verbal constructions which are similar to those in the Liuchao period. Both 來 and 去 can modify verbs with different lexical and grammatical characteristics: they may be verbs of energetic action directed at an object or those suggesting and motivating an action used both in verbal and in conjunctive clauses. In comparison with other modifiers, the modifiers 來 and 去 are more easily separated from the verb by placing other words in between the modifier and the verb.

Unlike the language of the previous period, which had its own **system of aspect and tense markers** placed before the verb, the language of the Tang Dynasty period has them placed after the verb.

**The suffix 得 –de**, modifying the aspect of result, can be joined to verbs of different semantic characteristics, including restrictive verbs of limited action. The verb with the suffix 得 most frequently functions as the predicate of a clause. Verbs with the suffix 得 are also used in clauses of consecutive conjunction, which often occur in folk literature of the Tang Dynasty epoch – it is in that period that the morpheme 得 first manifests itself as a suffix.<sup>21</sup>

Apart from, and in addition to, the verb-resultive sense, the suffix 得 has another meaning, which is close to 能 *neng* “be able to,” without covering it completely.

This can be proved by reference to examples of the simultaneous presence of 能 before the verb and of 得 after the verb. The position of Henri Maspero would seem to be too “optimistic” when he suggests that the form with 得 after the verb should be considered as a construction of potentiality, quite similar to the one in Modern Standard Chinese, although it must be admitted that, in a number of cases when 得 follows the verb, the meaning of 得 is the potentiality rather than the result.<sup>22</sup> With regard to the texts under analysis, it seems more proper to speak of the embryo stage of the potentiality category expressed with the help of 得 placed after the verb. The impossibility of an action is indicated by placing an infix 不 – before the morpheme 得. The impossibility of an action can also be expressed by the construction with 不得 preceding the significant verb.

**The morpheme 了 *liao*** is used to indicate consecutive actions, i.e. that one of the actions occurs before another one. In such a case, the simple sentence has two verbs with one of them – formed with the help of 了 – being a secondary predicate; as for 了, it can be placed directly after the verb (which is more frequent) or after the object.

Consecutive actions may be expressed in a complex compound sentence, with 了 placed either in a subordinate clause or in the main clause. The verb with 了 in the perfective sense may follow a modifier with the meaning of time; if this is the case, then the verb describes an action occurring before the moment of speech but with a result that is still felt at the said moment.

The morpheme 了 is placed directly after the verb in the prevailing number of examples with 了 in the texts under consideration, which may be regarded as evidence of an active development of 了 into a suffix. However, this development is far from being complete.

As regards the **morpheme 著 *zhao***, Maspero’s opinion appears correct: when 著 is placed after the verb, it is difficult to accurately describe the resulting sense.<sup>23</sup> The nearest sense is that of an unexpected result achieved by chance. Moreover, the morpheme 著 may be the modifier of a secondary verb, meaning an action that takes place simultaneously with the action signified by the main verb.

The place of the **adverb** in a sentence has been the same throughout the history of the Chinese language: the position of an adverb is between the group of the words comprising the subject and the group of the words comprising the predicate; the function of the adverb is to modify the group of the predicate (both verbal and conjunctive). At the same time, some adverbs can take a position at the very beginning of a sentence before the subject; in this position the adverb modifies the entire sentence and its function is close to that of parenthesis. In the course of historical development, the class of adverbs has been increasing due to many words from other word classes joining it.

Thus, **the meaning “only”** can be expressed by the adverbs 只 *zhi*, 祇(祗) *zhi*, 但 *dan*, 唯 *wei*. The two latter adverbs are common for the language of the Liuchao period, while the two former adverbs only manifest themselves in the Tang Dynasty period. In addition to common semantics, the adverbs in this group have a common

formal feature, i.e. their ability to take two possible positions in the sentence, either preceding the group of the predicate or at the very beginning of a sentence before the group of the subject; in the first case the adverb is more frequently a modifier of the object while in the second case it modifies the sentence as a whole. In addition to one-syllable adverbs, there are disyllabic adverbs with the first element 祇 (祇, 只): 祇如 *zhiru*, 祇是 *zhishi*, 祇爲 *zhiwei*.

The functioning of the **adverb 但 *dan***, common to the language of Liuchao period, acquires new distinctive features in Tang Dynasty texts; in the period preceding the Tang epoch, the sense of the adverb tends to be associated with the object while in the Tang epoch the sense of the adverb is associated with the predicate, which is confirmed by the fact that the verb following 但 often has no object.

Common to the texts under consideration is the **adverb 還 *hai*** “still,” “yet” (not registered in the language of the previous period). The adverb 還 is used as a part of the construction 還……麼 *hai...ma*, 還……也無 *hai...ye-wu* – in other words, it is used in sentences containing a question. In addition to a separate 還, there is a disyllabic 還是 *haishi* “however,” “really,” “whereas” living on in Modern Chinese (it should be noted that 還是 is only encountered in the Chan *yulu*; no other text of the period contains it, *bianwen* included).

Other disyllabic adverbs having 是 as a second element include 正是 *zhengshi* “in fact, really,” “just,” which are also typical of Modern Standard Chinese, as well as 恰是 *qiashi* “just,” “namely” and 總是 *zongshi* “always,” “all”. Equally common in the Tang epoch are the function adverb 都 *du* (typical of the language of the previous period) and the disyllabic adverb 都來 *dulai* “all,” “always.” Absolutely new are the meanings of the **adverb 也 *ye*** “also,” “even” that first occur in the texts under study.

As regards the **adverbs of degree**, 大 *da*, 太 *tai* “very/highly” occur frequently, and 甚 *shen* and 極 *ji* occur rarely. The adverb 太 occurs both independently and in the construction 太……生 *tai...sheng* in which it corresponds to the modern 樣 *yang* and 然 *ran*, according to the opinion of Zhang Xiang.<sup>24</sup> The authors of “A study of function words in pre-modern Chinese” state that the functions of 生 are many and various, including the function of an intensifier.<sup>25</sup>

In the field of **negations**, the most common one is 不 *bu*: unlike its function in the previous period, it is used now in making up the form of impossibility of an action and in a part of the negation 不會; moreover, 不 forms the prohibitive negations 不要 *buyao* and 不用 *buyong* that are common in Modern Standard Chinese. The frequency of the **prohibitive negation 莫 *mo*** in the texts under study is a stylistic feature of the didactic *yulu*, based on sermons.

The **preposition of an object: 將 *jiang* and 把 *ba***. Both function words (prepositions) may introduce an object with an instrumental meaning, with an objective meaning, and with other meanings that are hard to define. Formally, the conditions for the object in the texts under study are the same as those in Modern Chinese: as a rule, the verb has two objects; the verbal predicate either has a certain morphological structure or is disyllabic. Thus, 將 may perform the role

of preposition of an object with instrumental sense; when the verb governs two objects, 將 defines the object itself, with the addressee of the action placed after the verb. In some cases, the object may be omitted and 將 occurs immediately in front of the verb. In this position, 將 corresponds to the Classical Chinese 以 *yi*. As for the function of 把, the object may have both an instrumental and the objective meaning, and the verb may have the form of an ordinary transitive verb or of a verb expressing sentiments.

There are isolated examples in which the preposition is not marked materially: we may suppose that intonation acts as a substitute for objective inversion in such cases.

**Expression of questions** (namely, general question and alternative question, for the special question has been dealt with in the chapter on interrogative pronouns). The frequency of statements in the form of a question (this refers to the rhetorical question) is a specific feature of the *yulu* style: the speaker uses the interrogative form in order to attract the attention of the audience to the subject of the sermon.

**General questions** – or questions which require a “yes” or “no” answer – are formed with the help of the modal particle 麼 placed at the end of the sentence. Such sentences are numerous in the texts under study, and they are typical of Modern Chinese. However, they rarely occur in other written texts of the Tang Dynasty epoch. Another way of forming the general question is by placing a negator at the end of a sentence: negatives with this function are 否, 無, 未 *wei*; as a rule, the latter two negatives are preceded by the morpheme 也 *ye*.

**The question formed by placing the negation at the end of a sentence** is a shorter variant of the question formed by repeating the main verb or the verb with the object, in the affirmative and in the negative; sometimes the verb with the attributive adjunct is repeated (the attribute consists of adjectives that are antonyms). The unabridged variant of the question also occurs in the texts under analysis.

As regards the **alternative question**, its parts may follow one another without any formal units being added. The **rhetorical question** does not require an answer; however, it is formed in a similar way to a real question with the words 莫 or 還是 inserted in the sentence. In common with Classical Chinese, the rhetorical question may involve 豈 *qi*, 豈不……… *qibu*..., 豈無……… *qiwu*...

**Markers of the attributive.** There are two such markers in the texts under consideration: 底 and 地 *di* (the modern 的 does not yet occur). The usage of 底 in the language of the Tang-Song period is within the same framework as the usage of 的 in Modern Chinese. Thus, it was able to mark the possessive attributive expressed by a pronoun or by a noun, as well as the attributive to a name expressed by a predicative combination or an attributive to a name expressed by an adjective; in all such cases it is possible to find the attributive as the final word in the sentence, with the word it is supposed to describe omitted. The marker 地 indicates an attributive for the verb or the adjective; it is also used to mark the attributive to a name and, in this case, be expressed by an adjective (including the variant with the addressee word omitted). It should be noted in the latter case that it is possible to use both markers, 底 and 地,

with the latter characterized by reduplication, repetition of similarly rhymed words (as a rule, the former is not found with such characteristics).<sup>26</sup>

It may be observed in the texts under analysis that the two markers, 底 and 地, do not only demonstrate the juxtaposition of their functions, but the former seems to absorb all the functions of the latter. The morpheme 底 first occurs in the *yulu* of the Tang period.<sup>27</sup> In the texts under study it is encountered fairly frequently: in most cases it marks the attributive to a name and is commonly expressed by a verb, a predicative combination or by a whole sentence, with the form of the noun occurring rarely.

**The specific role of conjunctive sentences.** The need for the *yulu* texts to be functional and pragmatic has an impact on their style. Special features of the *yulu* style are found both in their vocabulary and their grammar. In the course of his sermon, the master often tries to underline, stress or emphasize this or that point. Thus, forming their “grammatical” style, the *yulu* texts required that its grammatical patterns should be laconic, elliptical, with a frequent use of constructions with inversion or transformation that play an important role in marking the style as distinguished and expressive. When achieved with the aid of specific grammatical means, the expressiveness becomes more categorical.<sup>28</sup>

It follows from the above consideration that the conjunctive sentence is one of the typical constructions regarding the style of the *yulu* language. A frequent case in such sentences is the variant in which the place of the subject is taken by the interrogative pro-predicate 如何 (with occasional occurrences of 云何) “what kind?”, “how are things?”, “what does it mean?”

The transformed constructions also include conjunctive sentences, in which the position of the subject is taken by the predicate (or a predicative combination); such sentences appear in the process of transforming the corresponding verbal sentences, when the grammatical predicate is the word (or words) that, logically, is the most important for the speaker, from his point of view.

Also emphatic is the construction with 是, in which it has a non-conjunctive (a not totally conjunctive) function: by this we mean the use of 是 in verbal clauses, at the beginning of a simple sentence (declarative or interrogative), or, occasionally – at the beginning of a conditional sentence.

Among the specific constructions worth mentioning is the use of 是 at the end of the sentence; in this case 是 may be followed by 也. (As for 是也 at the end of a sentence, this construction is well known in Classical Chinese, in which it is used to emphasize the preceding part – similarly to the modern 就是這個 *jiushi zhege*, 就是這樣 *jiushi zheyang* “namely,” “just.” The usage is registered in the language of Buddhist literature dating to the 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> cc A.D.).

In constructions with 是 at the end of a sentence, the subject may be marked by 者 *zhe* (sometimes, 底). It may be supposed that the construction .....者 (.....底) .....是 arose by analogy with the older construction .....者.....也, also performing the role of emphasis. One of the absolutely typical constructions in the *yulu* texts is the use of 是 in the alternative question.

The word, or morpheme, 處 is another grammatical feature that confirms the unique degree of vernacular quality in relation to the Chan-Buddhist *yulu*. Characterized by a wide range of senses and extremely commonly used in the texts of the Tang Dynasty epoch, it is only in the *yulu* texts that 處 demonstrates its function as a word-forming element. It is with the aid of this element that the predicative root gives rise to a noun with an abstract sense (見處 *jianchu* “opinion”, “aspect”, 用處 *yongchu* “benefit”, “practice”).

Similarly to its usage in the language of the Dunhuang *bianwen*, the **morpheme** 解 *jie* with the sense of ability can be used as a modal verb in the *yulu* texts. Like other modal verbs, it can either stand in front of the significant verb or be separated from the verb by the words belonging to it.

The expression of obligation involves the use of 當 in the language of the previous period, while the *yulu* texts sometimes involve the morpheme 合 *he* (note: the examples mainly occur in the PSSP). As a rule, 合 stands immediately in front of the verb.

## On the Language of the Song-Yuan Epoch

There are descriptions of grammatical patterns typical of the Song-Yuan period, all based on the texts written in the *xiaoshuo* genre.<sup>29</sup> However, the picture of a language cannot be complete if the grammarian does not take into account all sources belonging to the period under study, irrespective of genre or style. This makes it obvious that texts written in the different genre of folk prose, namely the *pinghua* literature, should also be analyzed – all the more so as the sinologists have utterly ignored this genre in the past.<sup>30</sup>

### 1. On the Structure of the Chapter

In the process of analyzing the language of the Song-Yuan period on the basis of the many texts selected for this paper, a clear framework has been found for arranging the source material in this particular chapter. The optimum form appears to be a detailed description of grammatical structure of the *Xinbian Wudai shi pinghua* 新編五代史平話 (another name, *Wudai shi pinghua* abbreviated to WD), with information on the language of the *Five fully illustrated pinghua* (*Quan xiang pinghua wuzhong* 全相平話五種) **given as footnotes** for comparison. This method of arranging material is due to the fact that the texts are not uniform; first and foremost, there are essential differences between the two texts from the point of view of the language used in the WD, on the one hand, and in the *Five fully illustrated pinghua*, on the other.

### 2. General Characteristics of the *Pinghua* Genre

There is no generally accepted definition of the *pinghua* as a genre of literature; the conclusion is based on sinology works available in this country and in the

world.<sup>31</sup> However, a special entry dealing with *pinghua* previously existed in the encyclopedia *Yongle dadian* 永樂大典 (alas, in the lost part of it), and, according to the catalogue *Si ku quanshu zongmu* 四庫全書總目 (no.54, p.1), the entry included stories from history recited by the street story-tellers.<sup>32</sup>

Opinions differ, and the sinologists' opinions on the term *pinghua*, and on the texts covered by the term, differ greatly. However, all their differences do not conceal the fact that those who study the genre *pinghua* agree about it being associated with historical legends or tales, which has the name *jiangshi* (講史) in the Song period; some researches consider *pinghua* to be a secular analogue to the *bianwen* literature. Thus, the Chinese sinologist Lu Gong (cited by A. N. Zhelokhovtsev in his book on the urban stories in Medieval China) suggests that a *bianwen* story about Wu Zixu should be included in the *pinghua* literature, since the story is not attributed to a Buddhist monk, does not preach any religious dogma and, consequently, cannot be a text in the *bianwen* genre.<sup>33</sup> Lu Gong believes<sup>34</sup> that the legend about Wu Zixu is an historical tale of the *jiangshi* kind, which, in his opinion, is supported by the fact that the manuscript never used the word *bianwen* in its title, which was later added by the compilers of the collection.<sup>35</sup>

In addition to *Wudai shi pinghua* (hereafter, WD), the source material includes the texts of the *Five fully illustrated pinghua* that are continuously ignored by sinologists.<sup>36</sup> At the outset of the research, the intention was to consider all the texts as one source, however, the approach had to be altered due to two remarks (contradicting each other, in my opinion. The first remark belongs to Zheng Zhenduo: "It is reasonable to suppose that the stories have more than one author, but their somewhat coarse and clumsy style makes all five books appear as one and the same."<sup>37</sup> The second remark is printed in the Editor's Foreword, warning the reader that, although the texts are not by one and the same author, the publisher had them made uniform in appearance so that all the texts have passages that look identical with other texts as regards the characters used, or the construction of sentences, or the style of description, etc. At the same time, the Foreword says that the degree of uniformity is not great, which is proved by the many passages that are typically primitive, both in style and content.<sup>38</sup>

The *Five fully illustrated pinghua* contains the following texts:

1. *Pinghua on how Wuwang attacked Zhou* (hereafter, WW) (武王伐紂平話 *Wuwang fa Zhou pinghua*). The tale is based on actual events in Chinese history – the Zhou (周) tribes led by Wuwang fighting against Zhou Xin (紂辛), the last ruler of the Yin dynasty. Traditionally, Chinese historians date the events to the eleventh century BC.<sup>39</sup>
2. *Pinghua on the Springs and Autumns of the Seven States* (hereafter, QG) (七國春秋平話 *Qi guo chunqiu pinghua*). The title is followed by an explanation that the collection of stories is the "final collection" (後集 *houji*) with the subtitle "Yue Yi's intention against Qi" (樂毅圖齊 *Yue Yi tu Qi*). It deals with intertribal

wars in the seventh – third centuries BC, which brought about the rise of the Qin dynasty.

3. *Pinghua on the Annexation of the Six States by the troops of Qin* (hereafter, QB) (秦併六國平話 *Qin bing liu guo pinghua*). The title describes the contents: the events described in the story date back to the third century BC; the title is followed by an explanatory note, “The life of the First Qin emperor” (秦始皇傳 *Qin Shihuang zhuàn*).
4. *Pinghua on the History of the Former Han Dynasty* (hereafter, QH) (前漢書平話 *Qian Hanshu pinghua*). The text covers the events in the early Han period (3<sup>rd</sup> – 2<sup>nd</sup> cc BC); the title is followed by explanatory notes informing the reader that the collection is a sequel (續集 *xuji*) that narrates the story of “Empress Lühou executing Han Xin” (呂后斬韓信 *Lühou zhan Han Xin*).
5. *Pinghua on the History of Three Kingdoms* (三國志平話 *San guo zhi pinghua*). The story tells of the fall of the Han dynasty and of China breaking up into three states (2<sup>nd</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup> cc A.D.).<sup>40</sup>

The following texts are used for analysis in the present paper: WD, WW, QG, QB, and QH.

### 3. How Well Have the *Pinghua* Texts Been Studied?

Obviously, they have been little studied from the linguistic point of view. However, one text is luckier than the others: the WD, or *The newly composed pinghua on the History of Five Dynasties* – its historical and literary aspects have been studied in detail in Russia (Pavlovskaya, 1984). As regards the linguistic studies, mention should be made of a paper by M. V. Sofronov; the paper describes some characteristics of the language to be used as arguments for dating the text accurately.<sup>41</sup> The vocabulary of the WD has been considered in a reference book by Yan Shenxiu, *An illustrated commentary on the vocabulary of The newly composed pinghua on the History of Five Dynasties*.<sup>42</sup> Of special interest is the dissertation by an American sinologist, J. Crump, on certain linguistic features of the WD, which was not available for sinologists in Russia; the thesis, written fifty years ago, demonstrates the approaches analogous, or even identical, to those that were worked out, and are applied, in this country for the purposes of an analysis and description of the historical grammar of the Chinese language irrespective of the period it belongs to.

As regards the present subject of analysis – the text of the *Wudai shi pinghua*, I fully support the statement by J. Crump that the text, though undoubtedly of the Song-Yuan era, cannot be dated more accurately.

The following analysis is provided in order to prove this statement.

#### 4. Grammatical Features of the Text *Wudai shi pinghua*

Analysis of the WD text, a comparison with the texts of the *Five fully Illustrated pinghua*, as well as the comparison of the latter with the WD, may help us with dating the *Wudai shi pinghua*, which is not an easy task.

#### 5. Words Acting as Substitutes

**Personal pronouns.** In the WD text, the first person pronoun commonly used is 我 *wo* (pp. 8, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 124 ff); the variant 我每 *womei* is used in rare cases (pp. 25, 31); there are rare occurrences of 我等 *wodeng* and 我輩 *wobei*. There are cases of the fused form 俺 *an* (p. 34) used in the text of QG,<sup>43</sup> it is used in the sense of “we” (plural).<sup>44</sup>

Particularly frequent in this text, as first-person pronouns, are the forms 咱 *za* and its variant for the plural – 咱每 *zamei* (note: for the *xiaoshuo* texts, these pronouns are typical of the texts that come from the North).<sup>45</sup> The pronouns 咱 and 咱每 are most common in their function as a subject (mainly in an independent sentence, and sometimes in a clause). The attributive function is also registered (it may be unmarked or marked by 的), as well as the function that is expressed by the form 咱每, with no variants. The form 咱 can indicate both the singular and the plural; in the text under analysis, the singular is characteristic both of a separate 咱 and of the form 咱每.<sup>46</sup> An old marker of plurality, 輩 *bei*, is encountered in single examples.

The old first-person pronoun, 吾, is still used (not too frequently and in separate passages only).

The second-person pronouns are 你, 您 *nin*, 您每 *ninmei* “thou,” “you”. It should be noted that 你 (pp. 8, 22, 23, 24, 165 ff) occurs less frequently than 您 (pp. 12, 22,<sup>47</sup> 23, 24,<sup>3</sup> 32, 48, 65, 83, 88, 108, 109,<sup>5</sup> 127, 135, 160, 164, 169 ff).<sup>48</sup> In our text, the pronoun 您 may have different functions – those of the subject, the object, the attributive (this can be marked or unmarked); it can mean the singular or the plural.<sup>49</sup>

The old second-person pronouns, 汝 and 爾, also occur; the markers of plurality for them may sometimes be the morphemes 輩 and 曹 *zao*.

As for the third-person pronoun, 他 occurs, which may also be in the form 他每 *tamei* (which is common in Modern Chinese); 他 may have different functions in the sentence. There are some single cases of 它 *ta* (*tu*) which have an obscure meaning.

**Demonstrative pronouns.** In the text under analysis, the prevailing pronoun for the near demonstrative, “this” is obviously 這, which is also typical of Modern Chinese.<sup>50</sup> Its main function appears to be an attributive to the noun that follows the pronoun, either immediately or after a numeral with a classifier inserted between them (or just a classifier). Occasional examples demonstrate an independent 這 in the function of subject (mainly in a conjunctive clause); 這 never occurs in the function of object.<sup>51</sup>

There are combinations of 這 with other morphemes; e.g. these are several examples with 這裏 *zheli*, indicating a place (usually, with a preposition) and the pro-predicate 這般 (的) *zheban* (-*de*). The latter is found as early as in the Tang Dynasty texts; it was rather typical of different texts in the genre of *xiaoshuo* of the Song-Yuan period, but it does not exist in Modern Chinese; other pro-predicates will be considered later.<sup>52</sup> In addition to the new 這, the old 此 is also used – in particular, in the nominal function of an object (as noted above, 這 never occurred in this function).

The distant demonstrative “that” is denoted by 那; its usage is restricted to the function of an attributive which, in an absolute majority of cases, is superfluous (i.e. it is of no significance), and 那 is often omitted in translations from Chinese. The high frequency of 那 is hard to explain rationally; one has to suspect that the author is not well versed in the literary language of the period. Situations where there is an abundant use of 那 may be considered as being a specific stylistic feature of the text in question.<sup>53</sup> There are occasional examples of 哪裏 *nǎli*, but *nǎ* in this combination is interrogative. As a really significant attributive, 那 in combination with a noun meaning a period of time – 時 *shi* “time” (那時 *nashi*– “then”, “at that time”) – is placed, as a rule, at the beginning of a sentence (there is a fairly large number of examples of this usage).

**On suffixes of the noun.**<sup>54</sup> The suffixes registered in the texts under analysis are not numerous (子, 兒, 頭) or frequent.

**Interrogative pronouns.** For questions about persons, the pronouns used are 誰, 誰人, 甚人 “who?” (unlike other *pinghua* texts, the text under consideration does not have as many examples with these pronouns).<sup>55</sup> For questions about inanimate objects, the pronouns used are the following: 甚, 甚的 (甚底), 甚麼 “what?”

**On reflexive pronouns.** The category of reflexive pronouns is not typical either of the WD text or of the language of other *pinghua* stories.<sup>56</sup> On rare occasions, the WD text contains the one and only morpheme that is traditionally included in the chapters on reflexive pronouns; by this we mean the morpheme 自 “self,” which, strictly speaking, ought to be grouped with the distributive pronouns (in a similarly way as the morpheme 各 “each one”) rather than with the reflexive ones.<sup>57</sup> It should be noted that the usage of 自 (and of the single case of 自家) in the examples quoted does not appear ordinary or usual. There are single examples of 自身 *zishen* and 自己 in the WD text.<sup>58</sup> The occurrences of 自 in the WD are mainly found in the chapter on the Han Dynasty history (with some cases referring to the Zhou Dynasty period in the respective chapter); the chapter of the Han Dynasty history appears to be rather special, individual in the body of this historical text: it seems likely that it was added to it quite mechanically.<sup>59</sup>

On the whole, the usage of 自 in the text under analysis is comparable with that in the texts of the Liuchao period, when the pronoun 自 had a wide sense that was often hard to define: 自 always took its place in front of the verb, resembling the object in some cases.<sup>60</sup>

**Pro-predicates.** Among the non-interrogative pro-predicates, the most frequent

in the text is the word 恁地 (with its sense corresponding to the old 如此 “so,” “such,” “thus,” “the matter is like this”). This pro-predicate is rather typical of the texts written in the vernacular in the Song-Yuan epoch.<sup>61</sup> In the *pinghua* texts, this pro-predicate is usually an attributive to the verb or, on rare occasions, the predicate itself. The old pro-predicate 如此 is only found in single instances.

As regards the interrogative pro-predicates, the *pinghua* texts and, in particular, the WD contain pro-predicates with the initial morpheme 怎 *zen* (not found in the Tang Dynasty period and first registered in the Song-Yuan epoch): 怎, 怎生 *zensheng*, 怎不..... *zen bu...*, 怎個 *zenge*<sup>62</sup> (corresponding to the modern 難道 *nandao* “is that so?”, “really?”, 作麼生 *zuomasheng*, 作..... 麼 *zuo... ma* “how?”, “in what way?”, “why?”, “what shall I do/how should I act?”<sup>63</sup> Much more frequent than the others is the occurrence of the pro-predicate 怎 widely used in the *pinghua* texts; in the WD text this word appears repeatedly in all chapters, with the highest frequency in the chapter on the history of the Liang Dynasty.

**Questions containing a request for specific information in relation to quantity or number (substitutes for numerals).** The WD text shows the occurrence of 多少 “how much, how many?” (however, the examples that include it are not numerous), which lives on and is widely used in Modern Chinese.<sup>64</sup> Occasional substitutes for the numerals are the morphemes 幾 (幾個) *ji (jige)* “several,” “a few,” and 幾多 *jiduo* “multitude.”

The **morpheme 些 *xie***. In the WD text, the morpheme 些 is registered both as an independent unit and in combination with the classifier 個 *ge* – 些個 *xiege* (in other *pinghua* texts we also find the form 些兒 *xier*).<sup>65</sup> In the texts under analysis, 些 is seen mainly before the uncountables, which may be both concrete and abstract nouns (些 has the sense of plural measure, “some” with various synonyms), appearing as the object. The combination 些個 may be used as equivalent of the separate 些, i.e. as an attributive for the noun following it, or its function may be to define the verb, i.e. to correlate with the substitute of the predicate.

## 6. Reduplication

By far the largest number of samples with reduplication includes the names for kinsfolk: 哥哥 *gege* (WD 11,12,19,166) “elder brother,” 弟弟 *didi* (WD 166) “younger brother,” 妹妹 *meimei* (WD 166, 181) “younger sister,” 娘娘 *niangniang* “mother,” 爺爺 *yeye* (WD 121,185,194, 196, 223) “father,” 叔叔 *shushu* (WD 13, 160, 169) “uncle” (father’s younger brother), 舅舅 *jiujiu* (WD 15, 182, 185) “uncle” (on mother’s side), 爹爹 *diedie* (WD 169) “father,” “uncle.”<sup>66</sup> Closely associated with the above terms of relationship is the word 丈丈 *zhangzhang* (WD 13, 187) “honorable,” “highly esteemed.”

According to A. A. Dragunov, some cases of reduplication can express “division or distribution.”<sup>67</sup> Reduplicated adjectives also occur, which have the functions of nominal or, on rare occasions, verbal attributives. Generally, the attributives are not marked, but if they are – the markers are 的 or 地: 大大 *dada* (WD 109, 165,

188), 蒼蒼 *cangcang* (WD 12), 裊裊 *niaoniao* (WD 13), 汪汪 *wangwang* (WD 13), 草草 *caocao* (WD 200), 好好的 *haohaode* (WD 28), 小小地 *xiaoxiaodi* (WD 13), 匆匆 *congcong* (WD 196), 挺挺 *tingting* (WD 12), 垂垂 *chuichui* (WD 170) et al. Reduplication of adjectives signifies an intense quality; reduplication is chiefly used in descriptive passages of the narratives. There are occasional examples of reduplication in the class of numerals.

## 7. The Verb

**Compound verbs** in the WD text may be composed either of synonymous morphemes or of the verbal root plus a modifier.<sup>68</sup> As regards the verbs composed of morphemes that are synonyms or near-synonyms, there appears to be no marked distinction from the language of the preceding historical periods or from Modern Chinese. As regards the modifiers, there are not many in the text; the most common one is 取 *qu* “take;” in a number of cases, its meaning is the same as the one resulting from the reduplication of the initial verbal morpheme.<sup>69</sup> The modifier 取 may mean a successful action (however, there is no distinct difference between the two senses of 取 as a modifier; the sense appears to depend on the meaning of the initial verbal morpheme). There are single occurrences of other modifiers (住 *zhu* “to stop,” 盡 *jin* “to finish,” “to drain,” 開 *kai* “to open,” 放 *fang* “to let go,” “to throw away,” 做 *zuo* “make/do,” etc).

### Verbal Determiners/Suffixes

The **morpheme** 着 *zhao* is frequently used as the verbal suffix. With all its wide spectrum of senses, it may be considered as being impossible to define precisely (in this I support the remark of Maspero on the texts of the Chan *yulu* dating from the Tang Dynasty epoch).<sup>70</sup> When the verb with 着 as a suffix has the meaning of state/condition, then the sentence does not have any other verb except the one determined by 着. The verb with 着 as a suffix may mean an action that accompanies another action; in other words, it performs the part of a secondary verb signifying an action taking place simultaneously with the action of the main verb. In this case, the sentence necessarily contains the main verb as well. The morpheme 着 may indicate the duration of an action, but this meaning can only be deduced in the general sense, as there are no formal criteria. The action of the verb with the morpheme 着 may refer either to the past or to the future (which is determined from the context).

The **morpheme** 得 *de* occurs as the second verbal element (the suffix), along with other morphemes, with a high degree of frequency. In common with its usage in the period of the Tang Dynasty, the morpheme 得 is used to form the verb-resultive compounds with verbs of different semantic natures, including the verbs of the limiting sense.<sup>71</sup> The morpheme 得 may also accompany the verbs of emotion and speech. In this respect, the verb 聽 *ting* “hear” is the “luckiest,” as 得 as the second element occurs with this verb much more frequently than with any other verb.

The **morpheme** 了. The construction “V-了 *liao* + O” is quite common for the *pinghua* texts, with a variant “V + O + 了 *liao*,” i. e. when the morpheme 了 follows the object (which may be considered phrasal, indicating the advance of a new state/condition).<sup>72</sup> It should be noted that the difference in the grammatical meaning of the two constructions is rather difficult to establish. There are examples of the morpheme 了 being used twice in one phrase: one of them shows the perfective aspect, while the other one is the phrasal one, showing the rise of a new state.

**On verbal quantifiers.** There are single examples of these in the text of WD.<sup>73</sup> The quantifier 遍 *bian* occurs more frequently than any other word associated with numbers of action. In all examples with verbal quantifiers, the verb itself is marked with 了.

## 8. Adverbs

The **adverb** 且 *qie* occurs more frequently than any other adverb.<sup>74</sup> When 且 has the sense “then,” “only then,” it is a conjunctive adverb; it is at the beginning of a sentence, thus joining it to the previous sentence – in terms of their meaning. This usage of 且 makes it different from 且 with the sense “while,” “temporarily,” which is not connected with the previous phrase in any way. The adverb 且 can be used as a conjunction (with the sense “also,” “in addition to”). This usage of the adverb in question is not frequent in the WD; besides, it occurs in narratives only – not in a lively dialogue, which is understandable, as the adverb 且 was generally used as a conjunction (connecting words, phrases, clauses) as far back as Old Chinese.<sup>75</sup>

In the text under analysis, the adverb 且 is also used to express requests, offers, commands; this usage was typical of the Chinese language in the 3<sup>rd</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> cc A.D.<sup>76</sup> Characteristic of the *pinghua* genre, as well as of folk literature in general, is the combination 且說..... *qie-shuo*... (“And now we’ll tell...”; “We’ll tell more...”; “They tell a story...” etc), which serves to begin a new episode in the story. In addition to 且說, the beginning of a new development in the plot may be expressed by 却說..... *que-shuo*....

The **adverb** 但 *dan* is used in the following senses in the WD: “only,” “as soon as,” “just;” as a conjunction indicating contrast (even more frequently),<sup>77</sup> and occasionally its meaning is close to a conditional conjunction (“if only...”).<sup>78</sup> In some cases, the meaning of 但 is hard to define clearly.

The **adverb** 只 *zhi* is one of the adverbs with the sense of “only.”<sup>79</sup> Unlike the adverb 但 (dating from the Late Han epoch), 只 dates from the Tang Dynasty period.<sup>80</sup> All adverbs with the sense of “only” have one formal sign in common: their place in the sentence is either in front of the verb or at the very beginning of the sentence, in front of the subject. In the former case, 只 more frequently refers to the object, while in the latter case it refers to the sentence as a whole. In the text under analysis, the adverb mainly occurs in the former position and is fairly frequent.

There are single instances of the **morpheme** 價 *jia* occurring in the text under analysis; its meaning is not clear].<sup>81</sup>

## 9. Prepositions and Localizers

The text of WD does not demonstrate either a great variety of these words or a great frequency of their occurrence. One feature is characteristic of the text under consideration: the use of an adverbial particle with no preposition present.

The **preposition 向 *xiang*** introduces the object to whom the utterance is addressed; it occurs in the text more frequently than any other preposition. As a rule, the object with preposition 向 is placed in front of the verb (with the meaning of speech: 道 *dao* “say,” or, less frequently, 說 *shuo* “speak”).<sup>82</sup> An object with the preposition 向 may follow the adverb; in this case it has the sense of a person or an object that are addressees of the action (examples of this usage are rare in the text under consideration).<sup>83</sup>

The **preposition 與 *yu***, which is not used in Modern Chinese, often has the meaning of joining (“and,” “with”), and the verb may be preceded by the adverb 共 *gong* that has the same meaning as joining.<sup>84</sup> As for the Modern preposition with that meaning, 和 *he*, it is encountered in single instances. Also rare in the text is the construction with the meaning of likeness/similarity: ……與……一般 *...yu... yiban* “be comparable,” “be like”. Another meaning of the preposition in question arises from the verb 與 “give” and corresponds to 給 *gei* in the Modern language; Old Chinese used the preposition 爲 *wei* for this purpose. The usage of 與 with this sense dates back to the 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> cc A.D., not earlier.<sup>85</sup>

The **preposition 從** is one of the oldest prepositions dating from Old Chinese; it survived into the Liuchao period.<sup>86</sup> It occurs rarely in the text in question; it may indicate the starting point of an action – both in space and time (with the latter meaning often expressed by an even older preposition 自 in the WD). The construction “preposition ...localizer,” typical of the Chinese language of different historical periods, can also be used with this meaning. Nothing exceptional has been observed in the WD as regards the use of 從.

The **preposition 就 *jiu*** “in,” “on”, introducing an object with the sense of place/location, is one of the function words that have not survived into Modern Chinese.<sup>87</sup>

The localizer 裏 *li*, typical of Modern Chinese, is quite common, too, along with the old adverbial particles 內 *nei*, 中 *zhong*, “in,” “inside.”

## 10. Numeration Constructions

The construction “numeral – classifier – noun” (or “noun – numeral – classifier”) may be considered a regular pattern in the text under consideration, with an occasional occurrence of the old variant, “numeral – noun.”<sup>88</sup> Most common in the WD, though not regularly used, is the universal classifier 個, which is generally used in Modern Chinese. Other classifiers include 條 *tiao* “branch,” 隻 *zhi* “piece,” “unit,” 枚 *mei* “piece,” 雙 *shuang* “couple/pair/both” (for objects countable in twos), 張 *zhang* “sheet” (for things with a large open surface), etc. The construction in

question often appears in the form in which the classifier 個 is usually found in front of the noun, but constructions consisting of a numeral and some other classifier may be found both in front of the noun and after it.

## 11. Other Syntactic Constructions

The construction .....是.....的..... *...shi...de...*, sometimes .....的是..... *...de shi...* (and, more frequently, the sole 的) – all used for emphasis – are encountered in the text of WD (with the first one occurring in very rare cases).<sup>89</sup> It should be added that the construction .....是.....的..... may have the sense of ordinary connection/link/copula or of an attributive particle. The emphatic 的 refers mainly to the predicative construction. Occasionally, the meaning is even more stressed by using the particle 也 at the end of the sentence.

Another syntactic construction that is worth mentioning is the **preposition of the object involving the function morphemes 將 *jiang* and 把 *ba***. The verb in this construction may be defined by 了; it is the variant that is most common in the text in question. (Along with the attributive referring to the verb and placed on the left-hand side of the verb – and simultaneously with the attributive – the right-hand side may be taken by the combination of a noun and a numeral.)

The **passive construction with the modifiers 被 *bei* and 爲 *wei***. This construction is similar to the constructions considered earlier (i.e. 將 and 把); in both cases we are dealing with a pre-position: in one case the pre-position is taken by an object or the object at which the action (of the verb) is directed; in the other case it is an agent of the action expressed by the verb. The difference between the constructions including 將 and 把, on the one hand, and those including 被 and 爲, on the other, is in the fact that in the former case the nominative corresponds to the subject, while in the latter it is not the subject of the action. There are a number of variants of the construction with 被 (爲), in which 被 is an agentive preposition indicating the passive sense of the verb, while the nominative/subject is an object.

## Conclusions Drawn from the Grammatical Analysis of the WD Text

1. Various passages in the text have different proportions of *baihua* elements. As a rule, the major part of such elements occurs in the opening passages of the stories (上卷 *shangjuan*) dealing with the childhood of a future emperor (when he used to participate in other's children games, jokes or even fights); in describing such "events," the author's language is close to the vernacular of the period. However, when the person in question is on the throne, the stories told about him are mainly of orthodox character and the language has few *baihua* elements.
2. In the field of pronouns, the 1<sup>st</sup>-person exclusive fusion 俺 occurs only occasionally/by pure chance, while the inclusive 咱 (咱每) is used frequently;

for the 2<sup>nd</sup>-person pronoun, 您 is much more frequent than 你; for the 3<sup>rd</sup>-person pronouns, 他 is common, but there is also 它 (*tuó*) with a shade of malevolence. As regards plural markers, 每 is used, but 們 *mén* is not. As for the predicatives, there are occurrences of 這般 and 一般, but not a single case of the modern 這樣 *zhèyàng* and 一樣 *yíyàng*. As for the interrogative pronouns, there are no cases of using the prefix 阿 before 誰, and there are two cases of using 甚底, in which the (spelling) version 底 is held to be significant in trying to establish the exact date of the text in question.

In the field of verb: different types of verbal word-formation are used; the verbal modifiers are characterized by a certain set of senses (note: 着 can be used in the sense of 了, and vice versa). The morpheme 得 follows the verb rather frequently. The text does not show either a great variety of prepositions and localizers or any high frequency of their occurrence. Along with the old adverbial particles 內 *nei*, 中 *zhōng*, the modern localizer 裏 *lǐ* is also quite common in the text in question. Sometimes it corresponds to the preposition 在 *zài*. The prevailing numeration construction is “numeral – classifier – noun” (these are instances of the old version – without a classifier), with the most common classifier being the universal 個.

As a representative text of folk literature, the WD can be called the **written vernacular of its period**. Thus, a description of the characteristic linguistic features of the text gives a sufficient idea of the corresponding stage in the development of the Modern Chinese colloquial language. This concept of the text is in full agreement with J. Crump opinion.<sup>90</sup>

### The text *San chao bei meng hui bian*

This text consists of various documents on the history of diplomatic and military relations between the Song China and the Jin state, covering the period between 1117 and 1162.<sup>91</sup>

As regards the language of the literary manuscript, it contains lengthy passages from reports by the Song ambassadors who wrote down the diplomatic talks with the representatives of the Jin state; it should be noted that they often used the vernacular variant, especially when quoting their opponents. The talks seem to have been arranged in such a way that the preliminary oral negotiations looked like “flexible maneuvering” when compared to the ceremony of exchanging the written documents. “Flexibility” is always rather important in diplomacy. The negotiators were supposed to write down all discussion either during the talks or immediately afterwards. The written records of the talks were called *yulu* (which is “recorded speeches” 語). We have already dealt with the Chan *yulu* of the Tang epoch (texts containing talks, lessons, sermons of Chan-Buddhist Masters) and the Zhu Xi *yulu* of the Song epoch; now we have another version of the genre that was used in two ways: (a) when the negotiators came back to report to their emperor, they used their notes as a sort of schoolboy crib during their oral reports to the high officials; (b) in cases where there was a delay in the talks, special messengers carried the notes

to the Song Court with a request for further instructions. The Song Court officials were very cautious about their replies to the negotiators; e.g. if the reply contained some assurances from the Jin emperor, then the instruction from the Court was an exact copy of the relevant text from the respective *yulu* (which was the emperor's vernacular written down word for word). Then, the *yulu* were transferred into written reports to the throne, and they were then copied with great precision in the *San chao bei meng hui bian*.

Thus, the life history of the language material in which we are interested appears to follow this schedule: first, the *yulu* represented reports (奉使錄 *fengshilu*) that did not survive in their original form, but served to form a part of the text, on the one hand, while on the other hand some of them formed the basis of a work by a Song epoch author Yang Zhongliang 楊仲良 *Xu zizhi tong jian chang bian ji shi ben mo* 續資治通鑑長編紀事本末, dating from 1253.<sup>92</sup>

As Mei Tsu-Lin comments, in cases where the notes were written down after the talks (which is supported by documentation), all important words pronounced by the opponents were reported in *baihua*, while less important speeches and narratives by the Song representatives were written down in classical *wenyan*. Sometimes, the words spoken by one and the same person might be written down – every now and then – either in *baihua* or in *wenyan*.<sup>93</sup>

Listed below are the parts from the text *San chao bei meng hui bian* selected for analysis:<sup>94</sup>

1. Zhao Liangsi 趙良嗣 *Yanyun fengshi lu* 燕云奉使錄, dated from about 1125.
2. Ma Kuo 馬擴 *Maozhai zixu* 茅齋自叙.
3. Zheng Wangzhi 鄭望之 *Jing kang chengxia fengshi lu* 靖康成下奉使錄.
4. Wang Hui 王會 *Shaoxing jia yin tonghe lu* 紹興甲寅通和錄
5. Li Ruoshui 李若水 *Shanxi jun qian heyi fengshi lu* 山西軍前和議奉使錄.

In order to find out the proportion of the early *baihua*, the five texts were compared with the *Xu zizhi tong jian chang bian ji shi ben mo* 續資治通鑑長編紀事本末.

The reason for taking this text for comparison is its being based on two sources from the *San chao bei meng hui bian*, namely, *Yanyun fengshi lu* and *Maozhai zixu*. It should be noted that – when transferred into the *Xu zizhi tong jian chang bian ji shi ben mo* – many passages from both sources must have undergone a serious transformation from the *baihua* form into the *wenyan* form.<sup>95</sup> Consequently, the two texts may be considered identical in their contents, though different in their forms.

In order to prove that the language under analysis (with the five texts listed above) reflects the early *baihua* genre, two procedures should be carried out: (1) detachment of the grammatical units of the *baihua* from the text, and (2) comparison of the two texts that are identical in their contents, such as fragments from *San chao bei meng hui bian* and the corresponding passages from *Xu zizhi tong jian chang bian ji shi ben mo*, in terms of the grammatical and lexical elements of the language.

## I. *Baihua* Elements in the Language of the Texts under Analysis

1. Prevalence of Disyllabic Words (compound verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs).

Examples:

擒捕 *qin-bu* “catch,” “detain/arrest” (108);  
 讲和 *jianghe* “discuss the terms of a peace treaty” (100);  
 商议 *shangyi* “confer” (103);  
 攻破 *gongpo* “defeat” (102);  
 杀败 *shabai* “defeat,” “destroy” (100);  
 犒军 *kaojun* “reward (soldiers),” “celebrate” (107);  
 整顿 *zhengdun* “regulate,” “adjust” (108);  
 交付 *jiaofu* “hand” (102);  
 贪财 *tancai* “profiteer” (104);  
 酬答 *chouda* “reward” (104);  
 举起 *juqi* “lift/raise” (107);  
 押取来 *yaqulai* “pawn/pledge” (107);  
 隔着 *gezha* “separate” (102);

事力 *shili* “force/power” (106);  
 干戈 *gan-ge* “weapon/arms” (106);  
 世界 *shijie* “peace” (106);  
 田地 *tiandi* “lands,” “territory” (104);  
 地土 *ditu* “lands” (104);  
 苦辛 *kuxin* “hardship,” “sufferings” (104);  
 人户 *renhu* “people,” “population” (104);  
 官人 *guanren* “official” (104);  
 元帅 *yuanshuai* “commander-in-chief” (106);  
 道理 *daoli* “principles” (104);

容易 *rongyi* “light/easy” (106);  
 些小 *xiexiao* “minute,” “insignificant” (106);  
 艰难 *jiannan* “hard” (110);

不久 *bujiu* “soon” (107);  
 将次 *jiangci* “soon” (106);  
 永远 *yongyuan* “forever” (105);  
 方才 *fangcai* “just,” “just then” (104);  
 然后 *ránhòu* “then,” “later,” “afterwards” (101);  
 将来 *jianglai* “in the future” (101, 102 etc.);  
 也须 *yexu* “probably” (105);  
 一齐 *yiqi* “together,” “at once” (104).

2. Verbal Modifiers Typical of the *baihua* style of Chinese: 着 *zhao*, 了 *liao*, 得 *de*.

隔着 *gezhaō* (102)  
 待着 *daizhaō* (104)  
 急着 *jizhaō* (105)  
 写着 *xiezhao* (101)

拿了 *naliao* (100)  
 取了 *quliao* (101)  
 烧了 *shaoliao* (101)  
 守了 *shouliào* (104);  
 许了 *xuliao* (103);  
 杀了 *shaliao* (104);  
 谢辞了 *xieciliao* (113);  
 添了 *tianliao* (104) etc.

作得 *zuode*, 空得 *kongde* (104)  
 买得 *maide* (104)  
 了得 *liaode* (104)  
 杀夺得 *shaduode* (104);  
 说得 *shuode* (105);  
 合得 *hede* (104);  
 听得 *tingde* (101);  
 取得 *qude* (102);  
 记得 *jide* (110) etc.

### 3. Form of Possibility or Impossibility for an Action to be Performed

如只空得田地，都无人户，怎生**做得**? *Ru zhi kongde tiandi, du wu renhu, zensheng zuode?* (104) “If only [one imagines] the fields laid waste, with no population, how **can** [this] **be coped with**?”

恁地后怎生**整顿得起**? *Rendi hou zensheng zhengdun-deqi?* (108) “If so, then how does one **get** a proper disposition?”

使副只言道百万之物已多也，更**添不得**。 *Shi-fu zhi yandao bai wan-zhi wu yi duo ye, geng tian-bude.* (104) “The messenger’s assistant only said that millions of things was a sufficiently great number, and it **was impossible to make it greater**.”

### 4. Constructions with 把 *ba* and 將 *jiang*

……今日……**將**燕京许与南朝…… *jinri jiang Yanjing xu-yu Nanchao...* (102)  
 “...now [they] will consent to give up Yanjing to the Southern Dynasties...”

……数年前童贯**將**兵到边，却恁空回! ...*shu nian-qian Tong Guan jiang bing dao bian, que ren kong-hui!* (101)

“...several years ago, Tong Guan led the army to the border, but came back without having got what he wanted!”

何似把人民一齐许了..... *hesi ba renmin yiqi xuliao...* (104)  
“Wouldn’t it be better to promise a whole nation...”

莫且自家们如今把这事放着一边..... *Moqie zijiamen rujin ba zhe shi fangzhao yibian...* (104)

“Wouldn’t it be better for us to put this business aside now...”

看来贵朝狂悖之议，把本朝做破怀契丹看待，但恐后来被祸患不小耳！ *Kanlai gui chao kuangbei-zhi yi, ba benchao zuopohuai Qidan kandai, dan kong houlai bei huohuan bu xiao er!* (106)

“Obviously, the venerable Dynasty, in response to the violent controversies, laid the blame [for the fact of routing the Qidan] on the ruling Dynasty, for fear of being later exposed to suffering many hardships – alas – of no smaller severity!”

(In this example, the construction with 把 *ba* is not used in a common way; one would rather have expected 把破怀契丹做本朝看待.....).

.....把契丹墓宫室.....一齐烧了..... *...ba Qidan... mu gongshi... yiqi shaoliao...* (101)

“...the burial-ground and the Qidan palaces... burnt down at once...”

##### 5. Modifiers of the Attributive

回去底国书 *hui-qu-di guoshu* (101)

“the official letter [that was] **returned**”

同chybi znak和底公事 *tong-he-di gongshi* (101)

“official documents on **reaching agreement**”

天地齐生底国王 *tiandi qi sheng-di guowang* (101)

“**born at once by heaven and earth**, the ruler of the state...”

一个煞近上底官人 *yige shajin-shang-di guanren* (105)

“**awfully close [to the emperor]** dignitary”

杀了底许多人马 *shaliao-di xuduo ren-ma* (110)

“many men and horses **slain**”

有议的事 *you-yi-de shi* (110)

“a matter **of controversial character**”

可上可下的人 *ke shang ke xia-di ren* (110)

“a man **that could be pushed up and down**”

In the two examples that follow, the morpheme 的 indicates a noun:  
那租税便是文里的 *na zushui bianshi wen-li-di* (111)  
“those taxes exist [only] **on paper**”

更商量甚的? *geng shangliang shendi?* (105)  
“**What** else shall we discuss?”

It follows from the examples that the morpheme 底 is relatively prevalent in the texts under review, which agrees with the opinion of Lü Shuxiang; he believes that it was the morpheme 底 that was used for the attributives until the 13<sup>th</sup> century (from which the texts date).<sup>96</sup>

Another modifier of the attributive is 的, which is used occasionally. One may suppose that the latter modifier is the result of copying and editing the text at some latter period. It should be noted that all the examples that contain 的 are only found in the text *Shanxi jun qian heyi fengshi lu* by Li Ruoshui.

## 6. Words Used as Substitutes\*

The suffix 家 *jia* and the plural suffix 们 *men* are found among nominal function words. They are encountered both with the nouns and the pronouns.

In addition to the older demonstratives 彼 and 此, the texts contain 这 “this,” which is characteristic of the *baihua* style; it occurs in several forms: 这个 *zhege* (102), 这里 *zheli* (106, 111), 这些 *zhexie* (108) and 那 “that” (in single instances).

The pro-predicates are typical of the early *baihua*: the interrogatives 怎 and 怎生, as attributives to the predicate, occur more frequently than any other words of this kind.

The non-interrogative pro-predicate 恁地 “so,” “in this manner/way” is found in the function of predicate in a subordinate clause of time; in such a case, the main clause contains the interrogative pro-predicate 怎生, and the entire complex sentence becomes interrogative. An independent 恁 (with the same sense as 恁地) is found as an attributive either to the noun or to the predicate.

There are few words in the text with the sense of number or quantity: 几 *ji* is typical of the *baihua* style but in the *xiaoshuo* genre it does not occur at all. The word 许多 *xuduo* “many,” “much” is used both with countable nouns and uncountable ones; it occurs more frequently than any of its synonyms. The word 不少 *bushao* occurs in the sense “not little/not few.” Occasionally, questions about number or quantity contain the word 多少 “how many?”; there is not a single case of any other interrogative in the texts under review.

\* Function words referring to the noun; pronouns and pro-predicates; interrogative words; words signifying quantity and question words used with them.

## 7. Final Particles

There are occurrences of the final particle 则个 *zege* and the final interrogative particle 也无 *yewu*, both typical of the Medieval Chinese language.

**Comparison between the two texts  
(with regard to some grammatical and lexical parameters)<sup>97</sup>**

**San chao bei meng hui bian**

应是 *yingshi* “whole,” “all”  
 全是 *quanshi* “all,” “whole”  
 对云 *duiyun* (introducing direct speech)  
 讲和 *jianghe* “discuss the terms of peace”  
 中间……里 *zhongjian ... li* “inside”  
 不要 *buyao* “should not”  
 断绝 *duanjue* “stop/cease”  
 一般 *yiban* “similar,” “identical”  
 似 *si* “like/similarly”  
 不如 *buru* “not so”  
 怎生 *zensheng* “how?”  
 欢好 *huanhao* “rejoice”  
 是 *shi* (link)  
 儿媳 *erxi* “daughter-in-law”  
 要 *yao* “necessarily,” “wanted”  
 肯 *ken* “agree/consent”  
 恁 *ren* “to such a degree”  
 更 *geng* “more,” “again”  
 过……来 *guo... lai* “return”  
 才 *cai* “only then”  
 慢慢地 *manmandi* “slowly”  
 休说 *xiushuo* “stop (discontinue) conversation”  
 军人 *junren* “warrior”  
 州域 *zhouyu* “border/frontier”  
 田地 *tiandi* “land,” “territory”  
 感 *gan* “think of,” “care/take care of”

**Xu zizhi tong jian chang**

—  
 皆 *jie*  
 曰 *yue*  
 复和 *fuhe*  
 中 *zhong*  
 勿 *wu*  
 绝 *jue*  
 如 *ru*  
 如 *ru*  
 不然 *buran*  
 安得 *ande*  
 欢 *huan*  
 也 *ye* (quasi-link)  
 妇 *fu*  
 须 *xu*  
 许 *xu*  
 如许 *ruxu*  
 复 *fu*  
 归 *gui*  
 方 *fang*  
 安然 *anran*  
 无复言 *wufuyan*  
 卒 *zu*  
 疆 *jiang*  
 土 *tu*  
 顾 *gu*

The list of comparisons can be made much longer; hopefully, the samples quoted above are sufficient to demonstrate the differences, both grammatical and lexical, between two texts with absolutely identical contents. Obviously, the differences reflect the high proportion of the early *baihua* in the documents comprising the *San*

*chao bei meng hui bian*, which proves, once again, that it is both reasonable and necessary to take into account this source in order to study the historical aspect of the Song period in Chinese grammar.

## ABBREVIATIONS

PPiPIKNV – Pismennyje pamiatniki i problemy kultury narodov Vostoka

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> I. T. Zograf, *Ocherk grammatiki srednekitajskogo jazyka (po pamjatniku “Jin ben tongsu xiaoshuo”)*; I. T. Zograf, *Srednekitajskij jazyk (stanovlenije i tendencii razvitija)*.
- <sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, for the Liuchao and Tang period texts in the *xiaoshuo* genre, or, more accurately, writings compiled by original Chinese authors that were used as the secondary source-material: namely for Liuchao – *Researches for the Supernatural (Sou shen ji 搜神記)* by Gan Bao 干寶 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan 上務印書館, 1958); *A New Book of Narratives about the Contemporaries (Shi shuo xin yu 世說新語)* by Liu Yiqing 劉義慶 (In *Zhuzi jicheng 諸子集成* Vol. VIII. Shanghai 1954); *Notes of the Luoyang Monasteries (Luoyang jialan ji 洛陽伽藍記)* by Yang Xuanzhi 楊銜之 (Zhou Zumo 周祖謨 (ed.) Beijing, 1958). The final goal in examining the secondary sources is to make sure that the grammatical features of the main source may be considered typical of the language of the time as a whole.  
For the Tang, a rather specific *chuanqi* text – *The Grotto of the Playful Hermit (You xian ku 游仙窟)* by Zhang Zu 張鷟 was carefully inspected.
- <sup>3</sup> A detailed description of each of the three chapters of the research in question can be found in my earlier published books. Special attention in this paper is paid to the third period – the Song-Yuan epoch as the basis of the formation of the National Chinese language (*baihua*). The problem was examined thoroughly in my book *Historical Grammar of the Chinese Language. The Language of the Prose in baihua of the Song-Yuan Period (pinghua)*.
- <sup>4</sup> I. S. Gurevich, *Ocherk grammatiki kitajskogo jazyka III–V vv. (po perevodam na kitajskij jazyk proizvedenij buddijskoj literatury)*.
- <sup>5</sup> Wang Li, *Hanyu shigao, Vol 1.*, 32-35. Henri Maspero, “Le dialecte de Tch’ang-ngan sous les T’ang,” 10–11.
- <sup>6</sup> As stated above, the research is based on two types of text as source materials: these are the Buddhist works translated into Chinese (the main source) and non-Buddhist (the secondary one). As for the former ones, two items should be named as having been thoroughly inspected: the *The Sutra of Hundred Parables (Bai yu jing 百喻經)* (translated in 492 by Gunnarvridhi (Qinapidi 求那毘地) and *The Sutra on the Crown Prince Sudhana (Taizi Xudana jing 太子須大拏經)* the translation of which dates from the Western Qin (385–437). Other Buddhist texts were inspected in extracts included in an anthology by Chang Renxia, *The Selected Stories from the Buddhist Canon*, a series of 78 anecdotes from sutras selected in compliance with Édouard Chavannes’ *Cinq cent contes et apologues extraits du Tripitaka Chinois*. Thus, Chang’s anthology might be considered as a fairly reliable source. As to the latter (non-Buddhist) or secondary sources, the following works were inspected: *Researches for the Supernatural (Sou shen ji)*, compiled by Gan Bao (the terminal date for preparation of this book may be placed roughly at 350 A.D.), *A New book of Narratives about the Contemporaries (Shi shuo xin yu)*, a collection of records of certain incidents chronologically referring to the period from Eastern Han to Eastern Jin (25–420 A.D.), compiled by Liu Yiqing (403–444 A.D.), and *Notes of the Luoyang Monasteries (Luoyang jialan ji)*, compiled by Yang Xuanzhi (roughly just after 547).

- <sup>7</sup> I. T. Zograf, *Bianwen o Vozdajanii za milosti*; Henri Maspero, “Sur quelques texts anciens de chinois parlé,” 1–36; Gao Mingkai, “Tang dai chanjia yulu suojian de yufa chengfen,” 49–84; A thesis *Grammatika Tanskij tekstov* was defended by E. B. Kondratjeva in St. Petersburg State University in 2007; in the paper the grammatical peculiarities of *guwen*, Tang epoch short stories, and *dunhuang bianwen* are inspected.
- <sup>8</sup> S. E. Yakhontov, “Pismennyj i razgovornyj kitajskij yazyk v VII–XIII vv. n. e.,” 4–86.
- <sup>9</sup> The following texts were examined: *Linji lu* (臨濟錄), *Pang jushi yulu* (龐居士語錄), *Yunzhou Huangbo Duanji chanshi fayao* (筠州黃檗斷際禪師傳心法要), *Huangbo Duanji chanshi Yuanling lu* (黃檗斷際禪師苑陵錄), *Yunzhou Dongshan Wuben chanshi yulu* (筠州洞山悟本禪師語錄), *Ruizhou Dongshan Liangjie chanshi yulu* (瑞洲洞山良介禪師裕祿), *Fuzhou Caoshan Yuancheng chanshi yulu* (撫州曹山元澄禪師語錄), *Fuzhou Caoshan Benji chanshi yulu* (撫州曹山本寂禪師語錄). Among these, *Linji lu* was particularly carefully inspected as the most representative sample of the genre in question. At the same time, a thorough examination was undertaken of the earliest extant example of the *yulu* genre, going back further than the ninth century – the *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch* (further: PSSP). The text in question, one of the most famous Chan text that paid particular attention to the formation of the history and legends of the Chan-Buddhism. PSSP records the teaching of the Sixth patriarch Huineng, who is revered as one of the great figures in the founding of Chan. The importance of the text for the paper under consideration is as follows: it provides strong grounds for analyzing the process of the formation of the grammatical structure of the *yulu* of the IX–X cc. The history of the text of PSSP is rather complicated. See: I. S. Gurevich, “Sutra Shestogo Patriarcha”: obščheje i osobennoje v jazyke pamiatnika po sravneniju s drugim yulu,” 203–207. I. S. Gurevich, “Dve versii ‘Sutry Shestogo Patriarcha,’” 112–116. The papers listed used the edition: Philip B. Yampolsky (ed.), *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch. The text of the Tun-huang Manuscript with Translation, Introduction, and Notes*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967: 1–30. Citation gives the number of the “§”.
- <sup>10</sup> I. S. Gurevich, *Linji lu. Vstupitel'naja statja, perevod s kitajskogo, komentarii i grammatičeskij očerki*; I. S. Gurevich, and I. T. Zograf, *Khrestomatija po istorii kitajskogo jazyka III–XV vv.*; I. S. Gurevich, “Stilovyje osobennosti yulu kak zhanra (Grammatičeskaja stilistika),” 73–78; I. S. Gurevich, “On the Historical Grammar of the Colloquial Chinese Language of the Tang Dynasty (based on the Chan-Buddhist *yulu*),” 1–43.
- <sup>11</sup> Data on the grammatical features of *bianwen* are taken mainly from Zograf (see n. 7) and I. S. Gurevich, “Jeshcho raz o bianwen (zametki),” 96–101.
- <sup>12</sup> I refer to: I. M. Oshanin (ed.), *Bolšoj kitajsko-russkij slovar*; Wang Tongyi, *Yuyan dadian*.
- <sup>13</sup> Wang Li, *Hanyu shigao*, 285.
- <sup>14</sup> Zhang Xiang, *Shiciqu yuci huishi*, 355.
- <sup>15</sup> I. T. Zograf, *Srednekitajskij jazyk (stanovljenje i tendentsii razvitija)*, 148, 158.
- <sup>16</sup> W. A. C. Dobson, *Late Han Chinese. A Study of the Archaic Han Shift*, 74.
- <sup>17</sup> I. T. Zograf, *Srednekitajskij jazyk (stanovljenje i tendentsii razvitija)*, 150.
- <sup>18</sup> A. A. Dragunov, *Issledovanija po grammatike sovremennogo kitajskogo jazyka. 1: Chasti rechi*, 181.
- <sup>19</sup> The words 許多 and 數 are not interrogatives: the reason for including them in the chapter is the want of a special one for the numeral substitutes.
- <sup>20</sup> I. T. Zograf, “Bianwen o Vozdajanii za milosti (Rukopis' dunhuanskogo fonda Instituta vostokovedenija AN SSSR). Ch. 2: Grammatičeskij očerki i slovar’,” 61, n. 39.
- <sup>21</sup> Wang Li, *Hanyu yufa shi*, 88.
- <sup>22</sup> Maspero, “Sur quelques texts anciens de chinois parlé,” 20.

- <sup>23</sup> Ibid, 20–21.
- <sup>24</sup> Zhang Xiang, *Shiciqu yuci huishi*, 168–169.
- <sup>25</sup> Liu Jian, Jiang Lansheng and others, *Research of the function words of pre-modern Chinese*, 282–284.
- <sup>26</sup> It is Lü Shuxiang's point of view. See: Lü Shuxiang, *Hanyu yufa lunwen ji*, 51–58.
- <sup>27</sup> Wang Li, *Hanyu yufa shi*, 127.
- <sup>28</sup> A. A. Dragunov, *Grammatičeskaja sistema sovremennogo kitajskogo razgovornogo jazyka*, 197.
- <sup>29</sup> I. T. Zograf, *Srednekitaiskij jazyk (stanovljenje i tendentsii razvitija)*.
- <sup>30</sup> With the fortunate exception of the thesis of an American sinologist defended in 1950, see: J. K. Crump, *Some Problems in the Language of the "Shinbien Wudai Shy Ping-huah"*. Heartfelt thanks to my dear American colleague Professor Victor Mair who provided me with the possibility of getting to know this great work.
- <sup>31</sup> A. N. Zelokhovtcev, *Huaben – gorodskaja povest srednevekovogo Kitaja.*; L. K. Pavlovskaja, "O zhanre pinghua."; B. L. Riftin, *Istoricheskaja epopeja i folklorijna tradicija v Kitaje.*; M. V. Sofronov, "Ob istochnike i vremeni sostavlenija "Xinbian Wudai Shi Pinghua,"" 144–149.; J. K. Crump, "Ping-hua and the Early History of the San-kuo chih," 249–256; W. L. Idema, "Some Remarks and Speculations concerning P'inghua," 128; J. Průšek, *Origins and the Authors of the hua-pen*, 111–112; Cheng Yizhong. *Song Yuan huaben*. Here I stop listing.
- <sup>32</sup> Data are taken from the book: L. K. Pavlovskaja, *Zanovo sostavlennoje pinghua po istorii Pjati dinastij. Pervod s kitajskogo, issledovanije i komentarij*, 18.
- <sup>33</sup> A. N. Zhelokhovtcev, *Huaben – gorodskaja povest srednevekovogo Kitaja*, 49.
- <sup>34</sup> Lu Gong, "Tang dai de shuohua yu bianwen," 106–111.
- <sup>35</sup> Wang Chongmin (ed.), *Dunhuang bianwen ji*, 1. There is no need to discuss a more exact name forth genre of the text that "Wu Zixu" belongs to; at the same time it could be helpful if compare the correlation between different "stratums" of the language of "Wu Zixu" with those in *pinghua*. The results of a comparison of "Wu Zixu" with its historical foundation (?), which was Sima Qian's *Records of the Historian (史記 Shi ji)* (see: I. S. Gurevich, "K voprosu o zhanre nebuddijskih bianwen (na materiale bianwen ob Wu Zixuje)," 24–35), on one hand, and the *Pinghua on the history of the Five Dynasties* and Sima Guang's *Zi zhi tong jian*, on the other hand (see: L. K. Pavlovskaja, *Zanovo sostavlennoje pinghua po istorii Pjati Dinastij*, 24; Sofronov, "Ob istochnike i vremeni sostavlenija "Xinbian Wudai Shi Pinghua"").
- <sup>36</sup> If only the references on *pinghua* in works of literature studies, such as B. L. Riftin, *Istoricheskaja epopeja i folklorijna traditsija v Kitaje*; B. L. Riftin, *Ot mifa k romanu*; Liu Ts'un-yan, *Buddhist and Taoist Influences on Chinese Novels. Vol. 1. The Authorship of the Feng Shen Yan I*.
- <sup>37</sup> Zheng Zhenduo, *Chatuben Zhongguo wenxue shi*, 701.
- <sup>38</sup> *Wuwang fa Zhou pinghua*, 1.
- <sup>39</sup> Events about Wuwang's attack on Zhou, form the basis of the famous novel of the XVI c. *Feng shen yanyi* 封神演義, by Xu Zhongling 許仲琳 or Lu Xixing 陸西星.
- <sup>40</sup> For quotations, the following editions and the reprintings were used: Shanghai: *Zhonghua shuju*, 1954–1955. Other editions "discovered" during my work at Cornell University (Ithaca) and other libraries of USA were borne in mind. These are:  
1) Yuan edition of *Five fully illustrated pinghua* with comments. Zhong Zhaohua 鍾兆華 (ed.), *Yuan kan Quan xiang pinghua wuzhong jiaozhu* 元刊全相平話五種校註, Chengdu: Ba Shu shushe 巴蜀書社, 1989.  
2) *Qin Shihuang zhuan deng liuzhong pinghua* 秦始皇傳等六種平話[宋]佚名[元]無名氏著. Huaxia chubanshe 華夏出版社.

- 3) Ding Xigen 丁錫根 (ed.), *Song Yuan pinghua ji* 宋元平話集. 2 vols., Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社.
- <sup>41</sup> M. V. Sofronov, “Ob istochnike i vremeni sostavlenija “Xinbian Wudai Shi Pinghua”.”
- <sup>42</sup> Yan Shenxiu, *Xin bian Wudai shi pinghua yuhui lieshi*.
- <sup>43</sup> In the text of QG the pronoun 俺, typical for *baihua* of the time, occurs as frequently as the pronoun 我. There is an opinion that 俺 is representative of the northern *guanhua*. (See: Zograf, *Srednekitaiskij jazyk (stanovlenije i tendentsii razvitija)*, 45).
- <sup>44</sup> In the Dictionary of the language of the Song-Yuan epoch to illustrate the meaning of plural for 俺 an example taken exactly from the text in question is given. (See: Long Qian’an (ed.), *Song Yuan yuyan cidian*, 753.)
- <sup>45</sup> I. T. Zograf, *Srednekitaiskij jazyk (stanovlenije i tendentsii razvitija)*, 75, 203.
- <sup>46</sup> In the texts of the *xiaoshuo* genre of the time, the pronoun 咱 and moreover 咱每 denote the plural. Ibid, 53, 54, 72.
- <sup>47</sup> Index at the foot of the page number indicates the number of occurrences on the page in question.
- <sup>48</sup> In the texts in *xiaoshuo* of the time, among the 2-nd person pronouns the prevailing one is 你. (See: I. T. Zograf, *Srednekitaiskij jazyk (stanovlenije i tendentsii razvitija)*, 73).
- <sup>49</sup> Compare with the usage of 您 in the texts of Yuan pieces: functioning mainly as an attribute, 您 in most cases indicates plural. Ibid, 60, 62.
- <sup>50</sup> Compare with other *pinghua*: in the text of QG 這 is quite common, whereas in WW it occurs only twice.
- <sup>51</sup> Note: 這 is mostly used in the first half of the text.
- <sup>52</sup> In the Tang epoch the pro-predicate in question is met exclusively in the texts of the Chan-buddhist *yulu* and in few rare cases in the Dunhuang *bianwen* (I. T. Zograf, *Srednekitaiskij jazyk (stanovlenije i tendentsii razvitija)*, 148).
- <sup>53</sup> Analogous cases can be pointed out in the dunhuang *bianwen*; the only difference is that *bianwen* use 其 instead of 那. (See: Wang Chongming (ed.), *Dunhuang bianwen ji*, 26).
- <sup>54</sup> The information is given here as there is no special chapter on “Nouns”.
- <sup>55</sup> Much more frequently the interrogative pronouns are pointed out in the text of QH.
- <sup>56</sup> It could be considered a specific feature not only of the grammar but of the style of the *pinghua* as well.
- <sup>57</sup> It would be reasonable to regard the morpheme 自 as a semi-functional adverb as its position is in all cases pre-verbal. But, at the same time, 自 can also function as a “likely” object, which is impossible for an adverb. That is the reason for placing it in this chapter. (See: I. S. Gurevich, *Linji lu*, 225).
- <sup>58</sup> In the text of WW there is an example with 自身 in a post-verbal position as an object and there are also examples with 自身 and 自己 in pre-verbal position as subjects.
- <sup>59</sup> M. V. Sofronov, “Ob istochnike i vremeni sostavlenija “Xinbian Wudai Shi Pinghua”,” 49.
- <sup>60</sup> I. S. Gurevich, *Ocherk grammatiki Kitaiskogo jazyka III–V vv. (po perevodam na kitaiskii jazyk proizvedenii buddiiskoi literatury)*, 56.
- <sup>61</sup> Yan Shenxiu, *Xinbian Wudai shi pinghua yuhui lieshi*, 55.
- <sup>62</sup> The pro-predicate 怎個 is found exclusively in: Yan Shenxiu, *Xinbian Wudai shi pinghua yuhui lieshi*, 183.
- <sup>63</sup> The pro-predicates 作麻生 and 作.....麻 are widely used in the Chan-buddhist *yulu* of the Tang epoch. See: I. S. Gurevich, *Linji lu*, 236–237.
- <sup>64</sup> 多少 *duoshao* is much more frequently noted in the texts of other *pinghua*.
- <sup>65</sup> In the Dictionary of Song-Yuan... 些個 is explained as 一些 *yixie*, 一點兒 *yidianr* “a little”, “some”; 些兒 –as 些少 *xieshao*, 不多一點兒 *buduo yidianr* “a tiny bit”. See: Long Qian’an, *Song Yuan yuyan cidian*, 528.

- <sup>66</sup> According to A. A. Dragunov, the reason for reduplication in Chinese is the same as for corresponding words in other languages (compare with the Russian words *дядя, nana, няня* and so on). Maybe the cause of the phenomenon is the kind of familiar meaning these words contain in. A. A. Dragunov, *Grammaticheskaja sistema sovremennogo kitajskogo razgovornogo jazyka*, 141–142.
- <sup>67</sup> *Ibid*, 141.
- <sup>68</sup> The process of formation of compound verbs that arose in the Han epoch (See: Zhu Minche, *Xian Qin liang Han shiqi de dongci buyu*, 68–79), widely spread in the Liuchao (see: I. S. Gurevich, *Ocherk grammatiki Kitaiskogo jazyka III–V vv. (po perevodam na kitaiskii jazyk proizvedenii buddiiskoi literatury)*), continued during the Tang (see: I. S. Gurevich, *Linji lu*, 241 and next) is, naturally, presented extensively in the texts under study of the Song-Yuan period.
- <sup>69</sup> Yan Shenxiu, *Xinbian Wudai shi pinghua yuhui lieshi*, 120–121.
- <sup>70</sup> Henri Maspero, “Sur quelques texts anciens de Chinois parlé,” 1–36.
- <sup>71</sup> I. S. Gurevich, *Linji lu*, 242.
- <sup>72</sup> This statement in the first place concerns the *The five fully illustrated pinghua*: in these texts the construction mentioned became quite common. (But it does not concern the text of WD). Here are some examples:  
 太公看了文字大驚…… *Taigong kanliao wenzi da jing...* (WW, 70) ‘Taigong **having read the document**, was terribly frightened.’  
 ……不見了齊王。…*bu jianliao Qi-wang* (QG, 31) ‘…[Shi Bing] **has not seen Qi-wang**’.  
 鄒興插了槍…… *Zou Xing chaliao qiang...* (QB, 13) ‘Zou Xin **has thrust the spear** into …’  
 Note: in all three phrases the verb has an object and 了 occupies a post verbal position.
- <sup>73</sup> In rare cases verbal quantifiers are noted in the *Five fully illustrated pinghua*. The occurrence of the quantifier in the text of WW does not depend on the presence or absence of the verbal suffix (that is the difference between the texts of WD and WW).
- <sup>74</sup> Yan Shenxiu noted three meanings of the adverb 且 *qie*: 1) ‘while’, ‘temporary’ (it corresponds with the modern 暫且 *zhanqie*, 姑且 *guqie*); 2) ‘just’, ‘all-in-all’ ‘only then’ (corresponding to the modern 剛剛 *ganggang*, 才 *cai*); 3) ‘at the same time’ (corresponding to the modern 又 *you*, 并 *bing*). See: Yan Shenxiu, *Xinbian Wudai shi pinghua yuhui lieshi*, 116.  
 Let us note: there is no formal criteria for deciding the meaning of the morpheme 且; one should bear in mind the context.
- <sup>75</sup> T. N. Nikitina, *Grammatika drevnekitajskih tekstov*, 272.
- <sup>76</sup> I. S. Gurevich, *Ocherk grammatiki Kitaiskogo jazyka III–V vv. (po perevodam na kitaiskii jazyk proizvedenii buddiiskoi literatury)*, 137.
- <sup>77</sup> For Modern Chinese this meaning should be considered as the main one: I. M. Oshanin (ed.), *Bol'shoj kitajsko-russkij slovar'*, Vol. 2., 38. The meaning mentioned is given under number “1”.
- <sup>78</sup> Long Qian'an, *Song Yuan yuyan cidian*, 439.
- <sup>79</sup> In choosing one or other adverb with the meaning “only” there is a kind of distribution between the chapters of WD: for example, for the chapter on the History of Jin (晉) the adverb 但 is typical, and for the History of Liang (梁) and Tang (唐) the adverb 只是 quite common.
- <sup>80</sup> I. S. Gurevich, *Linji lu*, 245 and the next.
- <sup>81</sup> The morpheme 價 is found neither in the hand-book of Yan Shenxiu, nor in the *Song Yuan yuyan cidian*. Two meanings of the morpheme in question are found: an adverbial modifier and an adverb suffix. See: I. M. Oshanin (ed.), *Bol'shoj kitajsko-russkij slovar'*, Vol. 4., 690–691.
- <sup>82</sup> The usage of this kind for the preposition 向 was typical in the Liuchao period. See: I. S. Gurevich, *Ocherk grammatiki Kitaiskogo jazyka III–V vv. (po perevodam na kitaiskii jazyk proizvedenii buddiiskoi literatury)*, 148.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 149.

<sup>84</sup> This meaning for the function morpheme 與 was already common in Classical Chinese, typical for the Liuchao; it is just the same as is found in the texts in *xiaoshuo* in the Medieval Chinese. See: I. S. Gurevich, *Ocherk grammatiki Kitaiskogo jazyka III–V vv. (po perevodam na kitaiskii yazyk proizvedenii buddiiskoi literatury)*, 152.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 153.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 145.

<sup>87</sup> Yan Shenxiu in his hand-book showed that 就 could be used as a synonym of the preposition 在. Yan also paid attention to the frequent use of the morpheme 就 in the pieces *qu* (曲) of the Yuan epoch. See: Yan Shenxiu, *Xinbian Wudai shi pinghua yuhui lieshi*, 109.

<sup>88</sup> The occurrence/non-occurrence of the classifiers in the texts of the *Five fully illustrated pinghua* differs from one text to another. For example, in the QH a number of occurrences of the classifier 個 and occasional cases of 件 *jian* and 口 *kou* are noted; in the QB side by side with 個 (which could be used both with 兩 *liang* and 二 *er*), other classifiers (張 *zhang*, 口, 碗 *wan*, 匹 *pi* e.c.t.) are met. The classifier with the numeral in most cases took place after the noun. Examples: .....王翦伊虎兩個。... *Wang Jian Yi Hu liangge*. (QB, 14) ‘...both Wang Jian and Yi Hu...; 須索交他二個比試..... *xusuo jiao ta erge bishi*... (QB, 7) ‘...it is needful to urge both of them to compete ...’; 一口寶刀 *yikou baodao* (QB, 35) ‘a treasure sword; .....奪去馬一百餘匹。... *duoqu ma yi bai yupi* (QB, 32) ‘... he stole more than a hundred horses; 背負一張.....寶.....弓..... *bei-fu yizhang... bao... gong*... (QB, 32) ‘...[the commander] carried on his back ...a treasure...bow...’.

But in most cases in QB the combination “numeral + noun” functioned without any classifier, so that the position of the numeral was right before the noun. In WW a number of classifiers (口, 隻, 條, 封 *feng*, 首, 區 *qu*) are noted.

<sup>89</sup> In accordance with A. A. Dragunov, this kind of predicative-nominal sentence survives in Modern Chinese. The predicate in this type of sentence has a kind of modality: the speaker intends to emphasize or elucidate some point; for the aim mentioned using the construction 是.....的 seems the most expressive method of grammatical accentuation. See: A. A. Dragunov, *Grammaticheskaja sistema sovremennogo kitajskogo razgovornogo jazyka*, 194 and next.

<sup>90</sup> J. K. Crump, *Problems in the Language of the “Shinbien Wudai Shyy Ping-huah”*, 20.

<sup>91</sup> Fragments from the text in question can be found in the list that Professor Lü Shuxiang recommended for researchers in the field of the historical grammar of the Chinese language of different periods. See: Lü Shuxiang, *Hanyu yufa lunwen ji*, 198. There is an article of great importance written by a famous specialist on the history of the Chinese language, Mei Tsu-Lin with an English summary. See: Mei Tsu-Lin, “San chao bei meng hui bian li de baihua ziliao,” 27–52.; on the source in question also see: E. I. Kychanov, “Chzhurzheni v XI v.,” 269–281.

<sup>92</sup> Certain theses on the source are borrowed from the paper by Mei Tsu-Lin mentioned above.

<sup>93</sup> Mei Tsu-Lin, “San chao bei meng hui bian li de baihua ziliao,” 27.

<sup>94</sup> The passages used are borrowed from the book: Liu Jian, *Jindai hanyu duben*, 99–113. The abbreviate forms of the Chinese characters used in this part of the paper correspond with the forms in Liu Jian’s edition from where they are taken. The citation gives a page number.

<sup>95</sup> In accordance with Mei Tsu-Lin, the reason was that the Jin people in their speeches used mainly the *baihua*; the fact was recorded in the *yulu*. On the contrary, the ambassadors of Song in their speeches often used *wenyan*. See: Mei Tsu-Lin, “San chao bei meng hui bian li de baihua ziliao,” 27.

<sup>96</sup> Lü Shuxiang, *Hanyu yufa lunwen ji*, 52.

<sup>97</sup> In the highly valuable Appendix to his paper, Mei Tsu-lin gives a comparative table of passages from *San chao bei men hui bian* and *Xu zizhi tong jian chan bian ji shi ben mo*. To Mei's comparison I dare to add another level of such from the same two items: single grammatical and lexical units of early *baihua*, on the one hand, and of *wenyan*, on the other.

## References

- Chang Renxia 常任俠. *Fojing wenxue gushi xuan* 佛經文學故事選 [Anthology of stories from sutra literature.]. Shanghai: Gudian wenxue chubanshe, 1958.
- Cheng Yizhong 程毅中. Song Yuan huapen 宋元話本 [Huaben in the Song-Yuan epoch]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1964.
- Chavannes, Édouard. *Cinq cent contes et apologues (extraits du Tripitaka Chinois)*, I–IV vols., Paris: E. Leroux, 1934.
- Crump, J. K. *Problems in the Language of the "Shinbien Wudai Shyy Ping-huah"*. 1–2 vols. Doct. diss. New Haven: Yale University (unpubl.).
- . "Pinghua and the Early History of the San-kuo chih." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 71.4 (1951): 249–256.
- Dobson, W. A. C. H.. *Late Han Chinese. A Study of the Archaic Han Shift*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.
- Dragunov, A. A. *Issledovanija po grammatike sovremennogo kitaiskogo jazyka. 1: Chasti rechi*. Moscow–Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1952.
- . *Grammaticheskaja sistema sovremennogo kitajskogo razgovornogo jazyka*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Universiteta, 1962.
- Gao Mingkai 高名凱. "Tang dai chanjia yulu suojian de yufa chengfen 唐代禪家語錄所見的語法成分." [Grammatical Features in the Texts of the Tang Dynasty yulu in the dhyana school] *Yanjing xuebao* 燕京學報 34 (1948): 49–84.
- Gurevich, I. S. "K voprosu o zhanre nebuddijskih bianwen (na materiale bianwen ob Wu Zi-xuje)." In *Dal'nij Vostok*. Moscow: Nauka, 1961: 24–35.
- . *Očerki grammatiki Kitaiskogo jazyka III–V vv. (po perevodam na kitaiskii jazyk proizvedenii buddijskoi literatury)*. Moscow: Nauka, 1974.
- . "Jeshcho raz o bianwen (zametki)." In *PPiPIKVN XVIII godichnaja nauchnaja sessija LO IV AN SSSR (doklady i soobshchenija po Tanskomu Kitaju)*, 1983–1985. Moscow: Nauka, 1985: 96–101.
- . "Dve versii "Sutry Shestogo Patriarha." In *Obshchestvo i gosudarstvo v Kitaje: tezisy i doklady*. Ch. 1–3. Moscow, 1985. Ch. 1.: 112–116.
- . "Sutra Shestogo Patriarha": obshcheje i osobennije v jazyke pamiatnikapo sravneniju s drugimi yulu." In *PPiPIKVN XIX godichnaja nauchnaja sessija LO IV AN SSSR (doklady i soobshchenija)*. 1986. Ch. 1.: 203–207.
- . "Stil'evyje osobennosti yulu kak zhanra (Grammaticheskaja stilistika)." In *Aktual'nyje voprosy kitajskogo jazykoznanija: materialy V Vsesojuznoj konferentsii*. Moscow: 1990: 73–78.
- . "On the Historical Grammar of the Colloquial Chinese Language of the Tang Dynasty (based on the Chan-Buddhist yulu)." In *Annual Report*. The Institute for Zen Studies Hanazono University, Kyoto, XXII May (1996): 1–43.
- . *Linji lu. Vstupitel'naja statija, perevod s kitaiskogo, kommentarij i grammaticheskij ocherk*. Pamiatniki kul'tury Vostoka. XV. St. Petersburg: Peterburgskoje Vostokovedenije, 2001.
- . *Historical Grammar of the Chinese Language. The Language of the Prose in baihua of the Song-Yuan Period (pinghua)*. St. Petersburg: Peterburgskoje Vostokovedenije, 2008.

- Gurevich, I. S. and Zograf, I. T. *Khrestomatija po istorii kitajskogo jazyka III–XV vv.* Moscow: Nauka, 1982.
- Idema, W. L. “Some Remarks and Speculations concerning P’inghua” *T’oung Pao* 50 (1974): Livr. 1–3.
- Kychanov, E. I. “Chzhurzheni v XI v. (Materialy dlja etnograficheskogo issledovanija).” In *Sibirskij arheologičeskij sbornik*. Novosibirsk: Izdatel’stvo Nauka. Sibirskoje otdelenije, 1966: 269–281.
- Liu Jian 刘坚. *Jindai hanyu duben* 近代汉语读本. [Text-book on the pre-modern Chinese language] Shanghai: Jiaoyu chubanshe, 1988.
- Liu Jian 刘坚, Jiang Lansheng 江蓝生, Bai Weiguo 白维国, Cao Guangshun 曹广顺. *Jindai hanyu xuci yanjiu* 近代汉语虚词研究. [Researches on the function words of the pre-modern Chinese language] Beijing: Yuwen chubanshe, 1992.
- Liu T’sun-yan. *Buddhist and Taoist Influences on Chinese Novels. Vol. 1. The Authorship of the Feng Shen Yan I.* Wiesbaden: Kommissionsverlag Otto Harrassowitz, 1962.
- Long Qian’an 龍潜庵 (ed.). *Song Yuan yuyan cidian* 宋元語言詞典. [Dictionary of the language of the Song-Yuan] Shanghai: Cishu chubanshe, 1985.
- Lu Gong 路工. “Tang dai de shuohua yu bianwen 唐代的說話與變文.” [Shuohua and bianwen in the Tang epoch] *Minjian wenxue* 民间文学 6 (1962): 106–111.
- Lü Shuxiang 吕叔湘. *Hanyu yufa lunwen ji* 漢語語法論文集. [Collection of articles on the grammar of the Chinese language] Beijing: Kexue chubanshe, 1955.
- Maspero, Henri. “Sur quelques texts anciens de chinois parlé.” *Bulletin de l’Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient* 14.4 (1914): 1–36.
- . “Le dialecte de Tch’ang-ngan sous les T’ang.” *Bulletin de l’Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient* 20.2 (1920): 1–119.
- Mei Tsu-Lin 梅祖麟. “San chao bei meng huibian li de baihua ziliao 三朝北盟會編裏的白話資料” [Vernacular Dialogs Preserved in the *San chao bei meng huibian*] *Zhongguo shumu jikan* 中國書目季刊 14.2 (1980): 27–52.
- Nikitina, T. N. *Grammatika drevnekitajskih tekstov*. Moscow: Vostok-Zapad, 2005.
- Oshanin, I. M. (ed.). *Bol’shoj kitajsko-russkij slovar’*. 4 vols., Moscow: Nauka, 1983–1984.
- Pavlovskaja, L. K. “O zhanre pinghua.” In *PPiPIKNV IX godičnaja nauchnaja sessija LO IV AN SSSR (annotatsii i kratkije soobshčenija)*. Moscow: Nauka, 1973.
- . *Zanovo sostavlennoje pinghua po istorii Pjati Dinastij. Perevod s kitajskogo, issledovanije i kommentarij L. K. Pavlovskoj*. Moscow: Nauka, 1984.
- Průšek, J. *Origins and the Authors of the hua-pen*. Prague, Oriental Institute, Academia 1967.
- Riftin, B. L. “‘Pinghua o pokhode Wu-wana protiv Zhou Xinia’ kak obrazets kitajskoj narodnoj knigi.” In *Zhanry i stili literatur Kitaja i Korei*. Moscow: Nauka, 1969: 104–117.
- . *Istoričeskaja epopeja i folklornaja traditsija v Kitaje*. Moscow: Nauka, 1970.
- . *Ot mifa k romanu*. Moscow: Nauka, 1979.
- Sofronov, M. V. “Ob istochnike i vremeni sostavlenija ‘Xinbian Wudai Shi Pinghua’” In *Problemy vostokovedenija* 1 (1960): 144–149.
- Wang Chongmin 王重民 (ed.). *Dunhuang bianwen ji* 敦煌變文集 [Collection of bianwen from Dunhuang]. 2 vols. Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1957.
- Wang Li 王力. *Hanyu shigao* 漢語史稿 [The History of the Chinese Language]. 3 Vol. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe, 1957.
- . *Hanyu yufa shi* 漢語語法史 [The historical grammar of the Chinese language]. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2000.
- Wang Tongyi 王同億 (ed.). *Yuyan dadian* 語言大典. [A great Chinese dictionary] 2 vols. Beijing: San huan chuban she, 1990.

- Wuwang fa Zhou pinghua* 武王伐紂平話. [Pinghua on how Wuwang attacked Zhou] Shanghai: Zhongguo gudian wenxue chubanshe, 1955.
- Yakhontov, S. E. “Pismennyj i razgovornyj kitajskij jazyk v VII–XIII vv. n. e.” In *Zhanry i stili literatur Kitaja i Korei*. Moscow: Nauka, 1969: 74–86.
- Yan Shenxiu 閻慎修. *Xinbian “Wudai shi pinghua” yuhui lieshi* 新編“五代史平話”語彙例釋. [Interpretation of the vocabulary of the “Wudai shi pinghua” with examples as illustration] Taibei: Wen shi zhe chubanshe, 1988. Taibei, 1988
- Zhang Xiang 張相. *Shiciqu yuci huishi* 詩詞曲語辭匯釋. [A Collection of lexicology, poetry and drama with comments] 2 vols. Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 1954.
- Zhelokhovtsev, A. N. *Huaben – gorodskaja povest srednevecovogo Kitaja*. Moscow: Nauka, 1969.
- Zheng Zhenduo 鄭振鐸. *Chatuben Zhongguo wenxue shi* 插圖本中國文學史. [The illustrated history of the Chinese literature] 4 vols. Beijing: Zuojia chubanshe, 1957.
- Zhu Minche 祝敏澈. “Xian Qin liang Han shiqi de dongci buyu 先秦兩漢時期的動詞補語.” [The complement affiliated to the verb before the Qin and during both Han] In *Yuyanxue luncong* 語言學論叢. Di er ji 第二集. [A collection of articles on linguistics, 2-nd collection] Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1958: 68–79.
- Zograf I. T. *Ocherk grammatiki srednekitaiskogo jazyka (po pamiatniku “Jin ben tongsu xiaoshuo”)*. Moscow: Nauka, 1962.
- *Bianwen o Vozdajanii za milosti (Rukopis’ dunhuanskogo fonda Instituta vostokovedenija AN SSSR). Ch. 2: Grammaticheskij ocherk i slovar’*. Pismennyje pamiatniki Vostoka. XXXIV. Moscow: Nauka, 1972.
- *Srednekitaiskij jazyk (stanovlenije i tendentsii razvitija)*. Moscow: Nauka, 1979.