Chapter 9. Syntax

In this chapter, I discuss how Summers defined "sentence", "syntax", and other relevant terms. I also present his analysis of Chinese syntax and further explain the reasoning behind his thoughts and his innovative ideas, with some detailed examples from his works.

9.1 A general introduction to the topic of "syntax"

A "sentence" can be defined from different perspectives. Semantically, a sentence expresses a complete thought. Logically, a sentence consists of a subject, i.e., the topic, and a predicate, i.e., what the topic is about. Orthographically, a sentence is a unit that starts with a capitalised word and ends with a full stop. Grammatically, a sentence is an independent form, embracing smaller constituents, such as the subject, the predicate, the object, the attributive and the adverbial. Pragmatically, sentences are the dynamic and practical units of the language system, whereas words and phrases are stationary units.[281] How words are combined and how to form sentences are the topics discussed in syntax (Sun 2006, p. 147).

According to their structure, sentences can embrace one or more coordinated clauses (Shi 2017, p. 81). Furthermore, sentences can be divided into different types, such as declarative, interrogative, exclamative and imperative, according to their "modality" (Huáng Bóróng and Liào Xùdōng 2002, Vol. 2, p. 109), "value" (Chao 1968, p. 58), or "illocutionary force" (Shi 2017, p. 83).

There are no inflections in Chinese. Word order and function words present the grammatical relationships within sentences. Word order in Chinese is comparatively rigid. The unmarked word order is SVO and modifiers always precede the modified units.[282] The word order of any type of sentence in Chinese remains the same. Interrogative sentences can be identified by certain particles or by wh-words, and the affirmative and negative forms of the verb, for example, VO-NEG-V *kànshū-bú-kàn* 看書不看 'read [the] book-not-read' or V-NEG-VO *kàn-bú-kànshū* 看不看書 'read-not-read book' express the meaning of 'read the book or not' (Otting and Sybesma 2017, pp. 663–665).

---

[281] This part about the definition of sentences is based on Crystal (1997, p. 94) and Zhāng Bīn (2010, pp. 376–377).
[282] This paragraph about the word order is based on Xuē Fèngshēng (2000, p. 391), Wang (2005, p. 197) and Sybesma (2017b, pp. 589–590).

9.2 Summers and Chinese syntax

9.2.1 Relevant terms in Summers' works

In this section, I will discuss the concepts of terms like "sentence", "clause", "subject", "predicate", "object" and "syntax", and further discuss the relation between these concepts in Summers' research.

9.2.1.1 "Sentence" and "clause"

Summers defined "sentence" semantically and grammatically. He stated that a sentence is formed by words consisting of only two members, i.e., a subject and a predicate, to express a thought or an assertation (1863a, p. 180). He then defined subject and predicate logically by stating: "[e]very sentence consists of two members only; (1) the subject, or that thing about which something is said or predicated, and (2) the predicate, or that action or attribute which is asserted of the subject" (1863a, p. 180). The definition indicates that, for Summers, the subject and the predicate are interconnected and essential for a sentence. He further illustrated which kind of element can fill the slots of subject and predicate (see 9.2.1.2).

In some instances, the term "clause" in Summers' works refers to a complete sentence, for example, he wrote: "a clause which contains subject and predicate simply, is a predicative clause" (1863a, p. 180). This quotation reflects his definition of "sentence", i.e., a unit with a subject and a predicate. Yet, "clause" can also refer to a sentence-forming unit that is smaller than a sentence and very close to what we would generally consider to be a clause today, for instance: "[t]he subordinate clause stands to the principal clause [...] as its subject. [In this case, the subordinate clause] is a noun sentence" (1863a, p. 181). Furthermore, clauses also embrace even smaller units, similar to what we would call "phrases" today: "[a]n attribute appended to a subject forms an attributive clause [...]. The attributive clause cannot stand alone, because it does not express a complete thought, but only one of the elements of the sentence; e. g. 'the red rose,' 'the benighted traveller.'" (1863a, p. 180).[283] The "clause" in this quotation is closer to the sentence constituent. Overall, in Summers' terminology, the term "clause" has a wider range of meanings than "sentence", since the latter only refers to a unit including a subject and a predicate.

---

[283] What is also worth mentioning here is that, for Summers, the attribute of this kind of structure is the principal word (1863a, p. 180).

9.2.1.2 "Subject", "predicate" and "object"

Summers argued that the subject has to be a nominal constituent, such as a noun or even a sentence that functions as a noun (1863a, p. 183), which reflects "that thing" in his definition of the subject. He advised students to start analysing a sentence provided in the Chinese chrestomathy of the second part of his *Handbook* by first identifying the subject. His analysis of the example sentences reveals more clearly his understanding of a "subject". For example, in the sentence *Shēng rén bù néng yí rì ér wú yòng* 生人不能一日而無用 'Mortals cannot exist for a day without expending something',[284] Summers argued that *shēng rén* is the subject. The adjective *shēng* 'living' is the modifier of the noun *rén* 'people'. These two words form a nominal constituent, according to Summers' idea of "subject", serving as the subject of this sentence. Summers translated the Chinese sentences in his works as literally as he could, even though the English translation would sometimes sound strange (1863a, Part II, p. 21, footnote). Therefore, analysing his translation will help us understand how he approached Chinese sentences. The rest of the sentence *bù néng yí rì ér wú yòng*, based on his translation, is considered a predicate by Summers.

Another example given by Summers is: *xiǎodì zuórì jìnyè, búguò liáo biǎo yǎngmù zhī chéng* 小弟昨日晉謁，不過聊表仰慕之誠 'I, your humble servant, in waiting upon you yesterday, intended merely to show a slight mark of the sincerity of my respect'.[285] Summers argued that *Xiǎodì zuórì jìnyè* is the subject of the sentence (1863a, p. 183), therefore the second half of the example is the predicate. In this example, the "subject" *Xiǎodì zuórì jìnyè* 'I, your humble servant, in waiting upon you yesterday', according to Summers' translation, is a nominal constituent (although we might consider it to be a sentence or an embedded clause), in which *Xiǎodì* 'I' is the nucleus while (*zuórì*) *jìnyè* 'in waiting upon you' is a participial instead of a verb.[286] According to Summers' own perspective, they have to be considered as

---

[284] The translation is from the *Handbook* (Part II, p. 39). This sentence is from *Shèngyù guǎngxùn* 聖諭廣訓 *Sacred Edict*. The selected part in the *Handbook* (Part II, Chrestomathy, pp. 6–7) is from *Shèngyù guǎngxùn yǎn* 聖諭廣訓衍 *Sacred Edict Expansion* by Wáng Yòupǔ as suggested by Summers (Part II, p. 36, footnote). Most likely, one of Summers' reference works on this topic is William Milne's translation published in 1817 (1863a, Part II, p. 38, footnote) but his translation is different. In his *Handbook* (p. 183), Summers wrote: "cf. 7. a. 10, ii", among which "7" is the page of the chrestomathy in the second part, "a" marks the row and "10" indicates the line. In this way, the crossover point of the vertical and horizontal lines is the characters which the reader shall spot. However, "ii" here is a typo. It should be "11" (10–11) instead, since *shēng* 生 'living' is the tenth character, and it is an adjective here, which cannot serve as the subject according to Summers' definition of "subject".

[285] This sentence is from the Chinese fictional text *The Fortunate Union*, see 1863a (Chrestomathy, p. 8). For the translation of the sentence, see 1863a (Part II, p. 41).

[286] Davis translated the book into English and his translation was highly praised by Summers (1863a, Part II, p. 17). In Davis' book, this sentence is rendered as: "[m]y unsuccessful visit of yesterday was only a slight token of respect" (1829, Vol. II, p. 35), in which the subject is not a sentence either but a nominal element. It might have been the case that Summers consulted the syntactic structure of Davis' translation to develop his own version of

two nouns and their relationship is that the latter is "an adverbial expression of time, place, or manner" (1863a, p. 99). Hence, this entire sentence is a simple sentence (see 9.2.3).

A predicate, Summers claimed, generally needs to be completed by one or two objects.[287] For example: (*ruò shì gè zhìchéng lǎoshi de rén*) *kěyǐ yòng tā zài jiā chūrù* (若是個志誠老實 的人) 可以用他在家出入 '(If he is an honest man,) I can employ him in the family to go in and out'.[288] When there are two objects in the sentence, Summers stated, the one that follows the verb closely is called the "direct object" and the other is the "indirect object' (1863a, p. 184). However, Summers did not explain these concepts any further, nor did he give any examples.

9.2.1.3 "Syntax"

Syntax, according to Summers, is the study of how words combine with each other in order to express the relationship between them and how ideas are conveyed by different structures of sentences (1863a, p. 97).[289] The study of syntax consists of two objects in his definition, i.e., "the arrangement of words" (1863a, p. xii) and "the structure of sentences" (1863a, p. 180). The former focuses on the relation between words (1863a, p. 180). This is discussed in Section 9.2.2. In Summers' work, the latter is employed as the criterion to divide sentences into three types: i.e., simple sentences, complex sentences and compound sentences (which is explained in 2.3). Section 9.2.4 presents how Summers classified sentences according to their modality.

9.2.2 Summers' research on the relations of the words in sentences and on the word order
Summers proposed three relations between different words in sentences, namely:

(1) predicative relation—the relation between the subject and the predicate;

(2) attributive relation—the relation between a modifier and the unit that it modifies; for Summers, this kind of relationship basically applies to the nominal domain only. Adjectives, the genitive case of nouns, nouns in apposition in relation to a modified element, nouns with prepositions, and relative clauses are described as being able to serve as attributes (1863a, p. 181);

---

the English translation. The other version of the English translation of this work, which Summers mentioned (1863, Part II, p. 17), is by Thomas Percy (ca. 1729–1811). However, Percy did not translate the work literally (cf. Percy 1761, Vol. III, pp. 66–67).

[287] For more about "objects", cf. Section 9.2.2.
[288] This sentence is from *Water Margin*, see 1863a (Chrestomathy, pp. 13–16).
[289] The original text reads: "by syntax we mean to denote that arrangement of the words which expresses the relations existing between them, and the various forms of the sentence by which simple and complex ideas are exhibited."

(3) objective relation—the relation between verbs and their objects: for Summers, the function of the object is to complete or supplement the predicate, so he also called them "supplemental expressions" (1863a, p. 180). The elements that can be objects in sentences, Summers claimed, are either "the thing or person which the principal verb of the sentence affects", i.e., nominal elements,[290] or "the circumstances of time, place, manner or causality, which serve to modify the action of the verb" (1863a, p. 181). The latter category includes those that modify verbs, which are almost identical to adverbials (this will be discussed further in the next section when dealing with the "adverbial sentence").[291] In fact, Summers' argument about the latter is based on English grammar, or at least not Chinese grammar, which can be seen from his examples 'with smoke' in 'black with smoke' and 'this morning' in 'withered this morning'. He did not give any examples in Chinese.[292]

Summers claimed that the arrangement of words in sentences in Chinese is natural and logical. The basic word order in sentences, according to Summers, is SVO and the modifier precedes the modified elements, i.e., nouns follow adjectives, and verbs come after adverbs (1853a, p. 27; 1863a, p. 142; 1864a, pp. 70–71). Compared to the abovementioned "three relations" that exist in sentences, Summers appended a "modifier-modified" relationship between verbs and adverbs here, which is different from the "objective relation" mentioned above.

Moreover, Summers claimed that sometimes two verbs are placed directly next to each other without particles or other elements in between. In this case, the latter verb expresses the purpose of the former. For example, in the sentence *Tā lái, kàn* 他來，看 'he is come to look', *kàn* 'look' is the purpose of *lái* 'come' (1863a, pp. 128–129), which is what we call "serial verbal phrases" today.

Some other elements have rather fixed absolute positions in sentences in Summers' presentation, for example, elements that express the time (in this case, he means a point of time or "the time *when* of an action") are normally placed in one of two positions: either at the

---

[290] This explains why the attributive relation includes the modifiers of the subject and the object, as both of subject and the object are nominal.

[291] Compare the wording of the following examples:
1. "The object may be […] the *circumstances* of *time*, *place*, *manner* or *causality*, which serve to modify the action of the verb" (1863a, p. 181);
2. "Adverbial sentences are such as specify the conditions of *time*, *place*, *manner* or *causality*" (1863a, p. 181).

[292] The only possible Chinese example in his works is the elements that denote the duration of time. Summers stated that they have to come after the verb or "after the expression to which it belongs", together with the expression of length and height, for instance, *sāntiān* 三天 'three days' in *xiàyǔ sāntiān* 下雨三天 'it has rained three days' (1863a, p. 99, p. 114; 1864a, p. 71). However, it was not noted by Summers that this serves as the object of the verb in any way.

beginning of the sentence, such as *jīnnián* 今年 'this year' in *Jīnnián guŏzi duō* 今年菓子多 'this year there is much fruit' (1863a, p. 97); or between the subject and the verb, for example, *zuótiān* 昨天 'yesterday' in *Wŏ zuótiān dúshūle* 我昨天讀書了 'I read yesterday' (1863a, p. 114). Here Summers contradicted his own argument, because on page 114, he wrote: "[i]t should be noted that a point of time is placed first generally, but not before the subject of the sentence, and especially if this be a pronoun". On page 97, however, he said: "[t]he expression of the time when of an action generally stands first in a sentence". Hence, generally speaking, Summers' idea could be that the unmarked position of this kind of element should be in between the subject and the verb. These elements cannot be placed in front of the subject if the latter is a pronoun.[293]

9.2.3 Summers and the structure of sentences

Summers classified sentences into three types, namely "simple sentence", "complex sentence" and "compound sentence", based on their internal structure.

9.2.3.1 Simple sentences

A simple sentence includes only one clause with one set of subject and predicate. A simple sentence, according to Summers, is also called "predicate clause", in which "the verb is the principal word" (1863a, p. 180). Both the subject and predicate in a simple sentence can "be enlarged and modified to a great extent" (1863a, p. 181). Hence, the subject of a simple sentence can be constituted by one or more words, for example, a mono-word-subject *dì* 帝 'emperor' in *dì yuē* 帝曰 'the emperor said' or a multiple-word-subject *dàrén zhī dào* 大人之道 'principles of great men' as in the sentence *fán dàrén zhī dào yŏu sān* 凡大人之道有三 'Great men generally have three principles of action' (1863a, p. 181).[294] Regarding the second example, Summers explained that a subject can consist of two nouns in which the former one is "in the genitive case, to express the origin, cause, or relationship of the latter" (1863a, p. 184), i.e., *dàrén zhī* is in the genitive case to express the possession relationship to the second

---

[293] Another example of this type is the elements that denote locality. They follow the temporal elements, as claimed by Summers, for example (*zài*) *Běijīng* (在)北京 'in Peking' follows *zuótiān* 昨天 'yesterday' in *zuótiān zài Běijīng* 昨天在北京 'yesterday in Peking' (1863a, p. 98).

[294] On page 184 of his *Handbook*, Summers again cited this sentence as an example of the subject ("cf. 2. 9 [should be "g"]. 12–16"). However, in this instance, he argued that *fán dàrén* together is the subject of the sentence without any further explanation.

noun *dào*.[295] The particle *zhī* is mentioned by Summers frequently as the genitive marker. It is used as a common tool to "enlarge" or "explain" the subject. Summers' analysis of this sentence is in agreement with his definition of the "simple sentence". Summers further proposed that simple sentences are rather rare in Chinese. Most of the sentences are either complex or compound (1863a, p. 181).

9.2.3.2 Complex sentences

Complex sentences have a principal clause and one or more subordinate clauses, which serve as the subject, the attribute, or the adverbial of the entire sentence. These clauses are called "noun sentences", "adjective sentences" and "adverbial sentences" respectively, according to Summers (1863a, p. 187, p. 181).

Noun sentences are those which occupy the position of nouns in sentences for Summers, including a single verb, such as *yǐn* 飲 'drink' in *kǒng yǐn fēi qí shí yě* 恐飲非其時也 'I fear, to drink is not this time',[296] verb-object structure, for example, *hài rén* 害人 'injure people' in *hài rén bù hǎo* 害人不好 'to injure people is bad', or verb and "adjuncts of time", for instance, *xué ér shí xí zhī* 學而時習之 'To learn, and constantly to dwell on the subject' in *Xué ér shí xí zhī, bù yì yuè hū* 學而時習之，不亦說乎 'To learn, and constantly to dwell on the subject, is it not a pleasure!' (1863a, p. 184). The last example is integrated from the verb-object structure, i.e., *xí zhī* 習之 'dwell on the subject' and the verb "with adjuncts of time" structure (1863a, p. 184), i.e. (*xué ér*) *shí xí* (學而)時習之 '(learn and) constantly dwell on'. As mentioned above, Summers argued that the subject has to be a nominal element. When it is or has a verbal element, it is not a simple subject anymore, but becomes a noun sentence that is part of a complex sentence. Therefore, the essential part of a sentence is the verb. In other words, having a verb is the main criterion to prove that a unit is a sentence for Summers.

According to Summers, the adjective sentence is equivalent to a relative clause, and its function is to explain or modify nouns (1863a, pp. 184–185). Summers' explanation stated that as long as a unit can be translated into an English relative clause, it is considered an adjective sentence in Chinese. *De* 的, *suǒ* 所 and *zhě* 者 are sometimes used to mark an adjective sentence to modify a noun, and these particles are normally used to refer to the subject of the adjective sentences (1863a, p. 181, p. 185). These particles are the same as the markers of a

---

[295] His translation does not reflect his analysis literally in this case.
[296] Namely, "I suspect, this is not a time to drink" (1863a, Part II, p. 45).

noun sentence (1863a, p. 181, p. 184). For Summers, although a noun sentence and an adjective sentence formed with these particles are semantically and structurally different, adjective sentences often "assume the character of a noun". Summers gave an example to explain his idea (1863a, p. 185):

> *(Yí jiàn Tiě gōngzǐ lái bài, zǎo fēi bào yǔ Guò gōngzǐ,) gāng děngde Tiě gōngzǐ dào mén. (Guò gōngzǐ zǎo yī guān qíchǔ, xiào hāhā de yíngjiāng chūlái).*
>
> (一見鐵公子來拜，早飛報與過公子，）剛等的鐵公子到門。（過公子早衣冠齊楚，笑哈哈的迎將出來).
>
> ('Directly this man saw Mr. Tǐ going to visit, he hastened to give information to Mr. Kwo,) who was just waiting for Mr. Tǐ to arrive at the gate. (Mr. Kwo, ready dressed, came out to receive him, smiling, and with a respectful but cordial 'Ha! ha!'')[297]

Summers stated that *gāng děngde Tiě gōngzǐ dào mén* 剛等的鐵公子到門 'who was just waiting for Mr. Tǐ to arrive at the gate' is an adjective sentence, with *de* as the marker. The "antecedent" of this "adjective sentence" is *Guò gōngzǐ* 過公子 'Mr. Kwo', which directly precedes it. The relation between *Guò gōngzǐ* and the adjective sentence is appositional, and therefore the latter "assume[s] the character of the noun" (1863a, p. 185). However, Summers' explanation of the sentence is flawed. *Gāng děngde Tiě gōngzǐ dào mén* itself is independent from the sentence that precedes it. The subject is *Guò gōngzǐ* in the sentence *Guò gōngzǐ zǎo yī guān qíchǔ, xiào hāhā de yíngjiāng chūlái* 過公子早衣冠齊楚，笑哈哈的迎將出來 'Mr. Kwo, ready dressed, came out to receive him, smiling, and with a respectful but cordial 'Ha! ha!'', which follows it. Moreover, this example is unrelated to the relative clause, and *de* therefore does not mark it as such.

Summers' analysis of this example is entirely based on its English counterpart. However, this leads to a paradox: according to Summers' own argument, the modifier always comes before the modified unit in Chinese: "[a]ll attributive words and clauses precede. Hence the relative clause in English is to be turned into an attributive and placed before its antecedent noun (expressed or understood) in Chinese" (1864a, p. 71). However, in his analysis of the example, the "antecedent noun" *Guò gōngzǐ* precedes the adjective clause. In order to avoid a contradiction here, Summers had to employ the concept of "apposition" in the so-called

---

[297] The quotation is from *The Fortunate Union*, see: 1863a (Chrestomathy, 8.c.18; translation: 1863a, Part II, p. 41). The punctuation, explanation, and translation are all Summers'.

"adjective sentence" to state that the noun that the adjective sentence modifies or explains, i.e., its antecedent, is appositional in relation to the adjective sentence. His analysis, therefore, leaves traces of a foreign concept being applied to the Chinese language.

The last type of the clause that forms a complex sentence is the adverbial sentence. Adverbial sentence are used to "express the circumstances of *time* (i.e., the point of time, the duration of time or the repetition of the circumstance), *place* (i.e., rest in, motion to, or motion from a place), *manner* (i.e., similarity, proportion, or consequence), and *cause* (i.e., a reason, a condition, a concession, or a purpose)" (1863a, p. 185, pp. 181–182). Summers made a similar statement when talking about objects (cf. Section 9.2.2 above). For him, "adverbial sentences" would serve as the objects of sentences. However, the examples he gave here show a rather different argument. For example, *suànjì dìng le* 算計定了 'plans being determined on', *dào cìrì* 到次日 'the next day' and *rì wèi chū* 日未出 'before the sun was up' "are three adverbial sentences of time" of the sentence *suànjì dìng le, dào cìrì rì wèi chū jiù qǐlai* 算計定了，到次日日未出就起來 'His plans being determined on; the next day, before the sun was up, he arose',[298] in which the principal sentence is *qǐlai*. Summers claimed that *jiù* is not a necessary word but only a conventional word, whose function is to "summarize" the three adverbial sentences (1863a, p. 185). These elements are all placed before the verb; therefore, they cannot be the object of the sentence since, according to Summers, the word order in Chinese is SVO. One of the possibilities is that Summers' ideas about word order in Chinese sentences and which kind of elements can be objects were influenced by various scholars with different linguistic backgrounds. This is further explained in Section 9.3 of this chapter. Besides, Summers pointed out some patterns of the different adverbial sentences, such as a pattern of time "*yī*+ verb" as in *Yí jiàn Tiě gōngzǐ lái bài, zǎo fēi bào yǔ Guò gōngzǐ* 一見鐵公子來拜，早飛報與過公子 'Directly this man saw Mr. Tǐ going to visit, he hastened to give information to Mr. Kwo', and a marker of place *cóng... dìfang* 從...地方 'from…place' (1863a, pp. 185–187).

9.2.3.3 Compound sentences

A compound sentence includes simultaneously independent and co-ordinate clauses (1863a, p. 182). Summers claimed that there are three different types of compound sentences according to the relation between the clauses.

---

[298] The quotation is from *The Fortunate Union*, see: 1863a (Chrestomathy, p. 8; translation: 1863a, Part II, p. 41).

The first is a copulative relation, namely, one clause is the other's supplement. To be more specific, the two or more clauses in a compound sentence are (1) equally stressed semantically; (2) the second clause is stressed, such as sentences that are connected by "not only…but also" in English; (3) there are several clauses connected by particles that denote a sequence, just as "first, then, next, finally" in English, with stress increasingly laid on them; or (4) an alternative relation between two clauses is expressed by *huòzhě* 或者 'or' and *hái* 還 'or' (1863a, p. 182, p. 188). Summers provided some example sentences for these different types:

a. *dì xīn shí yǒu bù ān. Jīn yì bù gǎn jiǔ liú*

弟心實有不安，今亦不敢久留

'my mind would be truly ill at ease. As it is I would not presume to detain you for long'

b. *qiú lüè tíng ní shí, shǎo dòng yì cān*

求略停尼時，少動一餐

'only a very little time, to take a slight meal'[299]

c. *Jīn xìng yǒu yuán, yòu dé xiāng péi*

今幸有緣，又得相陪。

'Now happily we have had the good fortune to meet again to-day'[300]

d. *Hái shì dàng zhēn, hái shì dàng shuǎ*

還是當真，還是當耍

'Are you in earnest, or are you joking?' (1863a, p. 188).

Among these sentences, each clause in (a), (b) and (c) is stressed equally according to their meaning, while clauses in (d) are in an alternative relation. Summers did not provide examples for the second and the third type.

The second class of compound sentences consists of clauses with an adversative relation. The meaning of the clauses is contrary to one another. Summers further divided them into two sub-categories: the first category includes sentences in which the second clause negates the first one, just like "not… but" in English (1863a, p. 182). The second category refers to compound sentences in which the second clause limits the first, such as "only" in the sentence

---

[299] In the original text of *The Fortunate Union*, the text is 略停片時，少勸一餐 (Míngjiào zhōng rén 1994 [Early Qing], p. 194).

[300] Sentences (a), (b) and (c) are from *The Fortunate Union*, cf. 1863a (Chrestomathy, p. 9; translation: 1863a, Part II, p. 43). The punctuation, explanation, and translation are all Summers'.

"you may read it, only read it without stammering" in English (1863a, p. 182). Summers gave two Chinese examples for these two categories:

       a. *Qí rì yè zhī suǒ xī, píng dàn zhī qì, qí hào wù yǔ rén xiāng jìn yě zhě jǐ xī, zé qí dàn zhòu zhī suǒ wéi, yǒu gù wáng zhī yǐ*

       其日夜之所息，平旦之氣，其好惡與人相近也者幾希，則其旦晝之所為，有梏亡之矣

       'By the daily and nightly growth of virtue, the spirit which each dawn revives, makes all men similar in their love and hate; but the deeds which each day brings to pass, wither and destroy it'[301]

       b. *Xiǎo dì yì bù rěn yán qù, dàn zhuāng yǐ shù*

       小弟亦不忍言去，但裝已束

       'I, for my part, can hardly allow myself to speak of going; but as every thing is packed'[302]

Semantically, the first sentence is an example of the contradictory type, while in the second sentence, the second clause "limits" the first one, which is closer to "only" in English, according to Summers' classification.

    The third class of compound sentences is formed by clauses with a causative relation, in which one clause expresses the reason for the other (1863a, p. 182, p. 188); either the former clause shows the reason while the latter clause expresses the result or the other way around. For Summers, the order of the two clauses in causative relation can be changed and the meaning of the entire compound sentence remains the same. Therefore, these two types are in a "causative relation" semantically, although different particles may be used in these two kinds of sentences, respectively (1863a, p. 182). The examples from Summers are the following:

       a. *Dūn xiào tì yǐ zhòng rén lún*

       敦孝悌以重人倫

       'Give practical weight to filial piety and fraternal love in order to strengthen the relative duties'[303]

       b. *Shēng rén bù kě yí rì ér wú yòng, jí bù kě yí rì ér wú cái*

       生人不可一日而無用，即不可一日而無財

---

[301] The sentence is from *Mencius*; see: 1863a (Chrestomathy, p. 5; translation: 1863a, Part II, p. 35).

[302] This is a sentence from *The Fortunate Union*; see: 1863a (Chrestomathy, p. 9; translation: 1863a, Part II, p. 43).

[303] The sentence is from *Sacred Edict Expansion*; cf. 1863a (Chrestomathy, p. 6; translation: 1863a, Part II, p. 37).

'Mortals cannot exist for a day without expending something, and consequently they may not exist for a day without the means of doing so'[304]

c. *Shí jù zī dào, yǐ lì yú shì*

實具茲道，以立於世

'he was fully furnished with these principles for an example to the world'

d. *Wú yì wú sì, gù bù wéi*

无益吾祀，故不为

'There being no profit in keeping the sacred rites, they kept them not'[305]

According to Summers' translation, "result" also includes purpose or consequence, as can be seen in the first two examples. The second clauses in (c) and (d) express the results. Therefore, all four of these examples provided by Summers are actually in a "reason-result" causative relation. He did not give any examples in which the result is expressed in the first clause.

9.2.4 The modality of sentences

Summers divided sentences into five types according to their modality, or in his words, "form" (1863a, p. 183). This shows that for him, the "forms" of these sentences are different. These five types are the imperative sentence, which denotes a command; the optative sentence, which expresses a wish; the assertive sentence, which corresponds to judgements; the interrogative sentence in questions; and the exclamatory sentence, showing some exclamation. Summers arranged these five types in this order since for him, verbs naturally convey the imperative, while the optative sentence is closely connected to imperative sentences semantically, and the exclamation is different from questions only "by the manner of its enunciation" on most occasions (1863a, p. 183).

In imperative sentences, Summers argued, the subject is always omitted. If it appears, it is placed in front of the verb according to the basic word order of Chinese. However, when the subject is "a proper name or the designation of a person" and not a pronoun, the subject can be placed after the verb, just as in *lái, yǔ*! 來，禹! 'come, Yü!'. This example reflects Summers' semantic definition of "subject", i.e., "that thing about which something is said or predicated",

---

[304] The sentence is from *Sacred Edict Expansion*; cf. 1863a (Chrestomathy, p. 7; translation: 1863a, Part II, p. 39).
[305] These two sentences are from *The Epitaph of Jīzǐ*; see: 1863a (Chrestomathy, p. 2; translation: 1863a, Part II, p. 27).

as mentioned in 9.2.1.1. Optative sentences, Summers wrote, have almost the same form as imperative sentences, with only the verbs changing into those that express a wish or desire (1863a, p. 183).

The discussion of interrogative sentences takes up more space than the other types in the *Handbook*. He argued that some particles help to diagnose an interrogative sentence. The "particles" to which he referred are final particles, such as *ma* in *Nǐ yǒu qián ma* 你有錢嗎 'have you any cash?' and interrogative pronouns like *shénme* 什麼 'what' in *zhè yì zhī mǎ shí shénme* 這一隻馬食什麼 'what does that horse eat?'. In some interrogative sentences, there are no such "particles", and the "form" of the sentence, namely a positive expression and a negative expression, can also mark the interrogative sentence (for example, *Tā zài jiā bú zài jiā* 他在家不在家 'lit. he is at home not at home? → is he at home?', 1863a, p. 184). Summers argued that expressions like *duōshǎo* 多少 'lit. many-few→ how many' also belong to this kind. He did not discuss the positive-negative "form" of the verbs here, but only the presence of the semantic positive-negative meaning of a word in an interrogative sentence.

As mentioned above, Summers argued that there is not a big difference between interrogative sentences and exclamatory sentences, except the use of some particles that denote an exclamation instead of an interrogation (for example, *Shéi gǎn bú ràng, gǎn bú jìng* 誰敢不讓，敢不敬 'Who then would presume not to yield, and reverently to comply?').[306] In his translation, Summers used a question mark instead of an exclamation mark at the end of the sentence, but apparently, he is of the opinion that the sentence is an exclamatory sentence. This is not based on the interrogative pronoun *shéi*, but from the semantic meaning conveyed by the sentence.

It seems that the "form" of sentences is not the criterion that Summers employed to divide sentences into different classes, since these five so-called "forms" do not really differ from each other very much in Chinese according to Summers' own introduction, except for the meaning of the verbs or the appearance of certain particles. The "form" criterion may distinguish interrogative sentences and exclamatory sentences from other types of sentences but barely from each other. Therefore, Summers' criterion for classifying sentences is not purely based on their "forms" but rather their modality and meaning.

There are other aspects about Chinese sentences and syntax in Summers' works, for example, ellipsis. He argued that subjects in Chinese are often omitted either because of the

---

[306] This is a sentence from *Shàngshū*; cf. 1863a (Chrestomathy, p. 1; translation: 1863a, Part II, p. 25).

context or because of the preceding clause; for example the subject *I* is omitted in the sentence *Qiú nǐ gěi wǒ zuò zhèi ge* 求你給我作這個 'I beg you to do this for me' (1863a, p. 98; 1864a, p. 71), since the context is clear enough to diagnose the subject.

9.3 Syntactic research in Summers' reference works

In Priscian's time or even earlier, language units were placed in the hierarchy of sounds, syllables, words, and sentences, with the smaller units joining together to form the larger ones (Oniga 2016, pp. 289–290; McDonald 2020, p. 96, p. 177). In this view, there are no other units between words and sentences in the structural hierarchy. Inflections fill the gap between words and sentences[307] until the term "sentence member" was coined in 1747 by the French scholar Gabriel Girard (ca.1677–1748).[308] "Sentence members" are close in meaning to sentence constituents, and they include subjective, attributive, etc. They are the grammatical functions of phrases, not the phrases per se. Scholars like Henri Weil (1818–1909) in 1844 turned to research phrases from other aspects, for instance, semantics, rather than focusing on their function in sentences. These scholars argued that phrases are the "blending of ideas" and can be called "word groups". However, phrases as a concept did not become independent from their syntactic function until 1894, when John Ries (1857–1933) pointed out that words and phrases could both function as sentence constituents and that a specific phrase could be used as different sentence constituents, for example, as subject and as object.[309] Therefore, the concept of phrases was first considered within the concept of words, and then they were viewed from the perspective of their syntactic function. It was not until the late nineteenth century that the concept of "phrases" finally gained independent status.

In Summers' works, words like "phrase" (e.g., 1863a, p. 12) and other relevant "terms" also appear. However, Summers did not differentiate them from "words" at all.[310] Summers

---

[307] For example, the units that can be used as subjects are "nominatives".

[308] However, according to Oniga (2016, pp. 288–295), Gabriel was not the first scholar who argued for an intermediate syntactic unit between "word" and "sentence". He stated that Bohemian pedagogue Comenius (Jan Amos Komenský, 1592–1670) proposed such a unit with the term "phrasis" in the first half of the seventeenth century, but Comenius' ideas of this concept were unfortunately neglected. In the eighteenth century, when scholars finally realized the necessity of such a grammatic unit, instead of adopting Comenius' term, new terms were coined and popularized, i.e., French term *groups de mots* (Girard 1747) and German term *Satzglieder* (Becker 1841, cf. Oniga 2016, p. 295).

[309] The history of the research on phrases in this paragraph is based on Graffi (2001, pp. 136–142).

[310] In his *Handbook*, Summers wrote: "[i]t is, moreover, desirable that couples and triples of characters, which form phrases, should be sought for and committed to memory, so as to store the mind with good expressions, either for positive use or that they may be readily recognised when uttered by native Chinese" (1863a, p. xiv).

On the basis of this quotation, it seems that for Summers, a phrase is composed of more than one syllable. However, elsewhere in his works, a phrase is a short sentence or a word:

a. sentence: "[i]t remains for the student to collect <u>phrases</u> with the same consecutive tones, and to practise

followed the traditional hierarchy of "sound → syllable → word → sentence", without consulting the research on phrases. For him, words are combined to form sentences, as stated in Section 9.2.

As early as the Stoics (third century BC), the study of how words combine to form sentences was conducted (Seuren 2015, pp. 134–135). The notion that an assertion, a proposition or a statement embraces a subject and a predicate can be traced back to Aristotle (384 BC–322 BC) as *hypokeimenon*, i.e., "that about which something is said", and *katēgoreumenon*, i.e., "that which is said about it" (Law 2003, p. 168). Until the twelfth century, the notions of "subject" and "predicate" started to be applied to analyse sentences, and thus, syntactic research was finally integrated into pedagogical grammar. Despite that, during the Middle Ages, syntactic research was sometimes integrated into the study of the parts of speech (Luhtala 2018, p. 53). In the late eighteenth century, the terms "subject" and "predicate" became part of the mainstream grammatical tradition in Europe (Law 2003, p. 168; Luhtala 2013, p. 352).

With regard to the word order in sentences, Port-Royal grammarians Antoine Arnauld (1612–1694) and Claude Lancelot (ca. 1615–1695) argued that the "natural" order of word arrangement is nominative-verb-accusative (2001 [1662], p. 44), i.e., SVO is the "natural" word order. The same idea was presented by Humboldt and Rask in the nineteenth century by arguing that the natural order presents the natural sequence of thought (Graffi 1998, pp. 257–258; 2001, p. 25, p. 27). Summers adopted this argument and stated that Chinese words follow the natural order to form sentences (cf. Section 9.2).[311] Arnauld and Lancelot also emphasised the importance of verbs in sentences, which was adopted by Humboldt, who argued that the kernel of a simple sentence is the verb (Graffi 1998, p. 261, p. 263). Summers' analysis of the simple sentence also reflects the same point of view.

---

reading them aloud. Such <u>short sentences</u> may be found already marked with the proper tones in the body of this work" (1863a, p. 12, emphasis added);

b. word: "[t]he expression of length, height, or duration is placed after the <u>phrase</u> to which it belongs; e. g.-*kaū lŭ ch'ǐ* 高六尺 'six cubits high'. *taú-lú sź-lì* 道路四里 'the road is four miles long'" (1863a, p. 99, emphasis added).

Summers used many terms interchangeably with "phrase", such as "part of speech", "phraseology", "compound", "expression" and "group". He did not use them as technical terms, nor did he define them properly, just like how he treated "word". He used them like any other speaker of English would. The different terms for "phrase" are interchangeable, not only among themselves but also between them and "word" (cf. Appendix 3).

[311] The "copula theory" of Arnauld and Lancelot, i.e., every verb can be re-written into a form with a copula, for example, *Peter lives* is equivalent to *Peter is alive* (Arnauld and Lancelot 2001 [1662], p. 97; Graffi 2001, p. 76), also had some followers among the missionaries that preceded Summers. For example, Edkins (1853, p. 206) stated that the complete form of a sentence always includes a copula and the verbal predicate always includes the copula, but Summers did not share this opinion.

Research dedicated to Chinese syntax in ancient China is hard to find, as it was always mixed together with the study of function words and was not performed systematically. Special sentence patterns—for example, double negative sentences—were more widely studied by comparison and most of the research was conflated with the study of rhetoric (Shào Jìngmǐn 1990, p. 32).[312]

However, what will be shown in the next section is that the most influential syntactic work for Summers is *The Analysis of Sentences Explained and Systematized, after the Plan of Becker's German Grammar* (1852) by John Daniel Morell (1816–1891).

9.3.1 Summers and Morell's English syntactic research

Morell was a British philosopher and inspector of schools (Theobald 1894 [1891], p. 2), who believed that the study of syntax had to be strengthened over the study of etymology at schools (Morell 1852, p. v). As suggested in the title, Morell's analysis of syntax is based on Becker's *Deutsche Sprachlehre* (1829).[313] Based on this work *Deutsche Sprachlehre* (1829), Becker published two pedagogical grammars in 1831 and 1833. Becker's ideas about sentences and syntax are almost identical to Morell's and Summers'. For example, he argued that subjects and predicates form sentences, and that verbs or predicates are the most important elements in sentences. The relationship between subjects and predicates was called "predicate relation" by him. The scope of subject and predicate can be further expanded by adding attributes and objects. Therefore, there are three relations in sentences, namely a predicative relation, an objective relation (the relation between predicate and object), and an attributive relation (the relation between attributive and subject). Becker distinguished the complement object (like "object" in our terminology) from the determining object (like the modern term "adverbial"), in the sense that the former is necessary but the latter is not and the latter is actually an adverbial. This is the origin of Summers' point of view of the object, i.e., he considered both the complement and adverbial an "object". Therefore, there are five sentential components, i.e., subject, predicate, attributive, object and adverbial. Becker also classified sentences into simple sentences, complex sentences (*Hauptsatz and Nebensatz*), and compound sentences (*zusammengesetzter Satz*). The difference between the latter two is that clauses in compound sentences are logically instead of grammatically inter-connected, while clauses in complex

---

[312] Although no attention was paid to systematic syntactic research, the method of judging the full stop and pause (*jùdòu* 句讀) and rhetorical skills such as antithesis (*duìzhàng* 對仗) reveal the Chinese's intuitive perspective towards syntax (Shēn Xiǎolóng 2013, p. 329, p. 336).

[313] Morell also mentioned that his work got some inspiration from the school grammar of "Dr. A. Heussler", which is also based on Becker's principals (Morell 1852, p. v), but which I could not find.

sentences are the opposite. Complex sentences can be further divided into case sentences (*Kasussätze*, i.e., clauses expanded on subjects and objects), adverbial sentences (*Adverbialsätze*, i.e., clauses expanded on adverbials, which express the relation of time, space, result, reason, method and degree), and adjective sentences (*Adjektivsätze*, i.e., clauses which are expanded on the attributives).[314]

However, Summers did not mention Becker's *Deutsche Sprachlehre* at all but instead emphasised the importance of Morell's work (1863a, p. 181, footnote). Therefore, Becker first directly influenced Morell, and Summers gained indirect influence from Becker through Morell, although Morell was not the first one who introduced Becker's analysis to Britain.[315] As stated by Davies and Lepschy (1998, p. 95), Becker's syntactic analysis was very influential in German and English school grammars of the nineteenth century. Through Summers' work, a(n indirect) connection between Becker and Chinese syntactic research was established.[316]

Morell's book was very popular and in 1853, a second edition was published and titled *The Analysis of Sentences Explained and Systematised with an Exposition of the Fundamental Laws of Syntax*, with some revision and many exercises. Compared to the first edition, Summers' analysis received more influence from the second edition, which is presented in the following sections.[317]

9.3.1.1 Morell's definition of "sentence", "subject", "predicate", "object" and "syntax"

Regarding the construction of sentences, Morell argued that a sentence consists of two parts, namely the subject and the predicate (1853, p. 2). Between them, the verb (to be more specific, the "finite verb") is the vital and essential element of a sentence (1853, p. viii). For Morell, infinitive verbs feature as nouns, which serve as the subject or the object of a sentence (1853, p. 5). Hence, a sentence, according to Morell, must have a verb, and the nominal element takes second place. Semantically, Morell defined a sentence as a "complete utterance of a single thought" (1853, p. 1) from a logical perspective.[318]

---

[314] This paragraph is based on Graffi (2001, p. 138) and Vesper (2017, pp. 117–125).

[315] For an introduction to pedagogical English grammar, cf. Michael (1987, pp. 370–371).

[316] In fact, some of Becker's terms and ideas about syntax were discussed in one of Summers' reference books, *Organism der Sprache* (1841, cf. pp. 230–231; pp. 241–242; p. 470; p. 511, etc.). However, this work by Becker did not focus on explaining syntax systematically and Summers did not mention this work in the syntactic part of his book but adopted Morell's grammar instead.

[317] Summers only mentioned part of the title "Analysis of sentence", which can refer to both editions.

[318] This is also mentioned in the first edition of his work as "[a]ny number of words conveying a complete assertion" (1852, p. 9). This kind of definition can be traced back to Priscian, who argued that a sentence consists of a nominal element and a verbal element in order to express a complete thought (Graffi 2001, p. 113).

Morell also defined "subject" and "predicate". He first divided sentences into five categories according to their different "forms", namely assertive, interrogative, imperative, optative and exclamatory (1853, p. 1).[319] However, in the first edition in 1852, Morell separated sentences into four classes: affirmative, interrogative, imperative and optative, which is identical to Becker's classification: i.e., *Urteilssatz*, *Fragesatz*, *Wünschesatz* and *Heischesatz* (Vesper 2017, pp. 123–124). Considering Summers' terminology and classification of the modality of sentences, he was influenced by the second edition (1853), not the first edition (1852).[320] Morell then defined the subject and predicate on top of this: "[t]hat respecting which any Assertion, Interrogation, &c. is made, is called The Subject of the sentence: that which we say about the Subject is called The Predicate" (1853, p. 2).[321] Morell emphasised the close bond between thought and language. Although Summers did not define subject and predicate exactly the same way as Morell, he also defined them logically and adopted the five expressions of the "forms" of thought, together with the term "form" of Morell.

Regarding the object, Morell treated it as the complement of a verb (1853, p. 13), which is very similar to Summers. However, Morell argued that objects are necessary on some occasions, for example, when the verb is transitive (1852, p. 10; 1853, p. 13). In contrast, Summers stated that verbs generally need complements, without specifying any conditions.

Syntax, Morell stated, concerns the laws of how words combine to express thoughts (1852, p. 65; 1853, p. 81). He also mentioned that syntax deals with the relations between words (1853, p. 84), and listed the predicative relation, objective relation, and attributive relation (1852, pp. 65–66; 1853, pp. 84–85).

9.3.1.2 Simple sentence, complex sentence, and compound sentence in Morell's work

Sentences, according to Morell, are divided into three classes according to their inner structure, namely simple, complex and compound (1852, p. 27; 1853, p. 32). Among them, simple sentences refer to those that consist of only one sentence, but even the parts of a simple sentence can be "enlarged" (i.e., expanded by adding more elements, see below). As long as there is no finite verb involved in the procedure of enlargement, the sentence stays a simple sentence (1852, p. 27; 1853, p. 32). This again proves that for Morell, the presence of a (finite) verb is the criterion for identifying a sentence. Morell also explained the "enlargement" of the subject and

---

[319] The original text reads: "[t]he thought, we utter, may take the form of an Assertive, an Interrogative, an Imperative, an Optative, or an Exclamatory expression".

[320] However, Summers also discussed the modality in the section on simple sentences, which is the same as Becker (cf. Vesper 2017, pp. 123–124).

[321] Morell provided a very similar definition in the first edition (1852, p. 10).

predicate. He argued that a simple subject can add some adjectives, another noun in the possessive case or in apposition, and participles, etc. as adjuncts (1853, p. 4, pp. 6–7). Predicates can be enlarged by adding objects, which is called "the completion of the predicate", or by adding adverbials, prepositional phrases and other elements that "render its signification more specific and distinct", which is "the extension of the predicate" as stated by Morell (1853, p. 13, pp. 18–19).[322] Summers, however, took both ways of "enlargement" (the "completion" and the "extension") of the predicate as "object" (1863a, p. 181 and Section 9.2.2). Regarding the "extension" of the predicate, Morell's statement anticipated his and Summers' classification of adverbial sentences: "[t]he circumstances which determine more accurately the meaning of the predicate may be classified under four heads: i. Those relating to time. ii. Those relating to place. iii. Those relating to manner. iv. Those relating to cause and effect" (1853, pp. 20–21, including an explanation of each of them in pp. 21–25).[323]

A complex sentence, Morell argued, consists of a principal sentence, including the main subject and main verb and one or more subordinate sentence(s) with other finite verb(s) (1852, p. 29; 1853, pp. 32–33). Morell also divided subordinate sentences into three classes, namely the substantive sentence, the adjective sentence and the adverbial sentence (1852, p. 29; 1853, p. 34), and each of them were further divided into more detailed sub-categories (1852, pp. 29–36; 1853, pp. 34–35, pp. 37–39, pp. 41–48). For example, temporal adverbial sentences are further subdivided into sentences that denote point of time, duration of time, and repetition of circumstances (1852, p. 33; 1853, p. 42). They are not presented here in detail for a tautological reason, since Summers adopted Morell's thinking. However, Morell's statement about the "adjective sentence" is worth a few lines here. As mentioned in Section 9.2.3.2, Summers' analysis of the example *gāng děngde Tiě gōngzǐ dào mén* 剛等的鐵公子到門 'who was just waiting for Mr. Tǐ to arrive at the gate' is not based on Chinese grammar, and he noticed violations of the basic word order in Chinese. In Morell's explanation, the adjective sentence "explains or describes something respecting the antecedent noun, and therefore performs the function of an adjective to the whole sentence" (1853, p. 38). Both the term "antecedent" and the explaining of its function were adopted by Summers to analyse the example.

Concerning the compound sentence, Morell defined it logically, i.e., sentences that are formed by more than one principal assertion (1852, p. 38; 1853, p. 59). More specifically, the

---

[322] Similar account can be found in his work in 1852 (pp. 27–28).
[323] Similar descriptions can be found in the first edition (1852, pp. 19–21).

relation between each clause is copulative, adversative or causative (1853, pp. 59–63), which was adopted by Summers'.[324]

The concept of "clause", during Morell's time until the late nineteenth century, was similar to "expression", including "any group of words that possessed some semantic and syntactic unity" (Michael 1987, p. 333), just as in Summers' own application.

As can be seen from the above, the first edition of the *Analysis of Sentences* by Morell shows a stronger influence of Becker's German grammar, but Summers' works followed the second edition of Morell's work, in terms of the terminology and the classification of sentences according to their modality.

9.3.2 Syntactic research in Summers' sinological reference works

Some of the sinological works to which Summers referred do not include an independent chapter or section dedicated to syntax. Those sinologists often discussed Chinese syntax from a traditional European perspective of nominal cases, such as Gonçalves (1829, p. 146) and Endlicher (1845, p. 199). This shows that syntax is not one of their main concerns. A few authors, on the contrary, dedicated chapters or sections to syntax, just like Summers. For example, the third part of Edkins' work (1857, pp. 206–252) is titled "syntax". It includes chapters that are mainly concerned with figures of speech, such as Chapter 10 "Antithesis" (pp. 249–250).[325] Marshman (1814, pp. 499–541) also dedicated a chapter to syntax and Morrison (1815a, pp. 268–272) focused on Chinese syntax as well, and introduced its basic principles.

While discussing the arrangement of words in sentences, besides pointing out the different relations between words, Summers further elaborated on how different parts of speech combined with one another in more detail, for example, two nouns follow each other and so on (1863a, pp. 99–103). This part, as pointed out by Gabelentz (1878, p. 629), is similar to Schott's work (1857, pp. 55–77).

Generally speaking, Bridgman's two works greatly influenced Summers' research concerning Chinese syntax. One of them is his monograph on Cantonese (1841), and the other

---

[324] In the first edition, the terms are "coupled", "opposed" and "account" (1852, p. 38), which are different from those adopted by Summers.

[325] Antithesis refers to couplet sentences, and is used frequently in classical literature. Couplet verses are required to be parallel to one another in the sense of not only the number of syllables, the part of speech and the meaning of each word, but also the structure of phrases. Edkins gave some examples in Mandarin, such as *yí ge rén chàng bǎi ge rén hè* 一個人唱百個人和 'one man sang and a hundred joined in harmony' (1857, p. 249). *Yí ge rén* and *bǎi ge rén* are both numeral-classifier-nominal phrases, in which *yí ge* and *bǎi ge* modify *rén* and the entire phrases are used as the subject of the verbs *chàng* and *hè*. In this sense, antithesis also reveals that ancient Chinese writers were aware of some basic rules of syntax.

one is an article that was published in the *Chinese Repository* (1840). The statements of these two works are very similar to one another. Bridgman himself claimed that these ideas about syntax are summarized from Abel-Rémusat's work (1841, p. xv; 1840, p. 330). Summers not only borrowed the ideas but also the wording of the two works of Bridgman. Hence, he was directly influenced by Bridgman's works as opposed to Abel-Rémusat. For example, in his inaugural lecture (1853), Summers copied almost every single word of Bridgman's (1841, p. xv) general introduction about Chinese word order:

> In every Chinese sentence, in which nothing is "understood" the elements of which it is composed are arranged in the following order: the subject, the verb, the complement direct, and the complement indirect. Modifying expressions precede those to which they belong; thus, the adjective is placed before the noun [in Bridgman 1841, p. xv: substantive, subject or complement; the substantive governed before the noun that governs it], the adverb before the verb. (1853a, p. 27)

This paragraph shows how Summers understood the basic sentence constituents and word order. It also explains the origin of his idea: when there are two objects, the first one that follows the verb directly is called the "direct object". In fact, this point of view can also be traced back to Abel-Rémusat's work as mentioned above[326] with the examples of *tiānzǐ néng jiàn rén yú tiān* 天子能薦人於天 'the son of the heaven can recommend people to the heaven' and *yǔ zhī tiānxià* 與之天下 'give him the empire' (1822, p. 67). The noun *rén* after the verb *jiàn* in the former example is considered the direct object, while the object *tiān* of the preposition *yú* is taken as the indirect object of the verb *jiàn*. In the second example, the pronoun *zhī* is the direct object of the verb *yǔ* and the noun *tiānxià* is the indirect object, according to Abel-Rémusat. Therefore, his— just like Summers'— criterion of the direct object and the indirect object is their distance from the verb without considering the prepositions in-between. Other scholars also touched on the word order of Chinese. For example, they pointed out that attributes come before the nouns that they modify (Abel-Rémusat 1822, p. 44; Bazin 1856, p. 66) and adverbs are placed before verbs (Varo 2000 [1703], p. 155; Gonçalves 1829, p. 152; Edkins 1853, p. 180; 1857, p. 206). Wade mentioned several times that *bǎ* 把 is used to mark that the object is placed before the verb (1859, p. 28, p. 34), in other words, the unmarked order shall be verb-object.

---

[326] "Dans les verbes à double rapport, le complétaient direct se place après le verbe, et est suivi du complément indirect".

Regarding the research on the structure of sentences, Edkins proposed a similar analysis as Summers'. Edkins (1857, p. 206) argued that before discussing the relative position of words in sentences, the first step is to figure out how words combine to form potential units of sentences. This is the same train of thought as Summers'. Moreover, Edkins argued that the subject and predicate can be expanded, which he further explained how to do in different ways. For example, subjects can be enlarged by adding classifiers or adjectives (1853, pp. 208–209, p. 210). He also distinguished the subordinate sentence and the coordinate sentence (1853, p. 215, p. 226) and stated that coordinate sentences can be connected by adversative conjunctions and disjunctive particles, etc. (pp. 242–245). However, Edkins' works and Summers' differ from each other in many aspects. For example, regarding their terminology, Edkins adopted "subordinate clause" and "coordinate clause" (1857, p. 232), instead of "complex sentence" and "compound sentence" in Summers' works. "Compound sentence" for Edkins referred to both sentences that consist of subordinate clauses and principal clauses, and sentences that consist of coordinate clauses (1857, p. 232). Their detailed arguments are also different. For example, Summers divided complex sentences into noun sentences, adjective sentences and adverbial sentences, while Edkins divided them into relative clauses, explanatory clauses, comparing clauses and so on (pp. 232–241). Summers' research was certainly primarily influenced by Morell's work, not that of Edkins', which contrasts with Gabelentz's observation (1878, p. 629).

As for ellipsis, Edkins (1857, p. 224) mentioned that subjects can sometimes be omitted. Bazin (1856, p. 75) argued that first and second person pronouns are often omitted in colloquial Chinese. Summers borrowed some examples and explanations from Edkins (1857, p. 247), although they mainly concerned semantics instead of syntax. For example, the word *bàishòu* 拜壽 'lit. bow longevity' is considered the ellipsis of 'to visit and bow to any one on his birth-day' for the purpose of displaying elegance (1863a, p. 104). The verb *bài* has the meaning of "meet and salute in order to wish or congratulate" (*Modern Chinese Dictionary*, 2005, p. 32), not simply "to bow".

In general, the outline and main content of Summers' analysis of syntax was adopted directly from Morell (and indirectly from Becker) at its core. On top of that, Summers also referred to other sinologists' works in order to extract their ideas concerning Chinese syntax. Among them, Bridgman's works were the main source for Summers. Summers directly adopted the ideas, and even wording, from Bridgman, while Bridgman himself claimed that his statement is only a summary of Abel-Rémusat's. In other words, Summers fused the syntactic

research on European grammar together with the knowledge of Chinese syntax, in his analysis of Chinese sentences. Some traces of this "fusion" can be seen in some of Summers' examples that were mentioned in Section 9.2.

9.4 Scholars after Summers and Chinese syntax

Edkins' ideas about Chinese syntax remained unchanged in his later works. Wade did not dedicate a separate chapter or section to syntax in his masterpiece *Yü-yen Tzŭ-erh Chi* (1867); nor did he discuss simple sentences or complex sentences. Gabelentz's research on Chinese syntax is more profound and systematic, but his terminology and method of analysing Chinese syntax does not show any influence from Summers' works.

Douglas (1875, p. 39) noted that the basic word order in Chinese is SVO and that modifiers precede the modified units. He also stated that the direct object follows the verb, that the indirect object succeeds the direct object (1875, p. 39), and that the "person" involved follows the verb while the "thing" follows the "person" (1875, p. 49). Although his ideas are similar to those of Summers and Summers' precursors, he not only defined the direct and indirect objects by their distance from the verb but also made a connection between them and the denotation of the words. In neither of his works (1875, 1904) did he dedicate a chapter or a section to syntax. His explanation of Chinese sentences and syntax are mixed together with the discussion of Chinese word classes. He did not write about simple or complex sentences, either.

Overall, where Chinese syntax is concerned, the works of Summers' successors do not show any traces of Summers' influence.

9.5 Summary

For Summers, sentences are formed by subjects and predicates while verbs are the most important element. Syntax, according to Summers, is the study of the relation between words and the structure of sentences. The relations between words are predicative, attributive or objective. He divided sentences into simple sentences, complex sentences, and compound sentences. His analysis of example sentences in Chinese is very interesting. Some traces of his attempt to integrate European linguistic research into the peculiar features of the Chinese language can be found as he elaborated. Similar to his research on other topics of the Chinese language, the syntactic part of his work was heavily influenced by his precursors, especially that of Morell's (1853) on English and Bridgman's ideas of Chinese syntax. He is the first

sinologist to introduce Morell's and Becker's syntactic research into Chinese studies, although this element does not come through in his successors' research.