

*Fú* IN THE MAWANGDUI  
MANUSCRIPTS OF THE LAOZI  
AND IN THE REMNANTS OF QIN LAW

CHRISTOPH HARBSMEIER

1. Introductory remarks<sup>1</sup>

In *Grammata Serica Recensa*, Bernhard Karlgren defined without argument or elaboration: *fú*<sup>1</sup> "not (esp. not able to, not willing to) (*Shū*)" (Karlgrén 1957:136). I wish to argue that Karlgren here concisely made a basic point which supplements (without invalidating it) the important insight in Ding Shēngshù (1935) that *fú* is linked to the transitivity of the verb which it negates. My conclusion is that *fú* is basically restricted to verbs describing human dispositions or actions. With verbs describing dispositions or actions the success of which is beyond human control, *fú* has the force of 'to fail to', as in *fú dé* 'fail to get it'. With verbs that describe actions the success of which is within

---

\* I profited from thorough advice and singularly useful criticism on an early draft from Yu Min in Peking. I wish to dedicate the present essay to him. Zhu Dexi's initial doubt and final support has given me the courage to publish my results. Angus C. Graham has given generous help and incisive criticism, as usual. Hans Bietenstein and Göran Malmqvist have pointed out to me, at the last minute, that Bernhard Karlgren was in the habit of glossing *fú* as 'be unwilling to, be unable to'. Søren Egerod, Halvor Eifving, and Lu Jianming have contributed helpful comments. None of these scholars should, of course, be held responsible for any of the results or the mistakes which remain.

<sup>1</sup> *Editors' note:* Most Chinese names and expressions in the running text, here represented in *pinyin*, are given in Chinese characters in the appendix (glossary) or in the references section.

human control *fú* means 'refuse to', as in *fú tīng* 'refuse to listen to him'. *Fú jiàn* must mean either 'refused to see him, refuse to look at him' or 'fail to catch sight of him'. On my hypothesis it cannot mean 'happened not to see him'.<sup>2</sup> My translations in no way suggest that I want to take *fú* as a main verb. My verbal translations are only an attempt to focus and over-emphasise the special force of the negation.

It might be objected that the meanings 'not manage to, fail to' and 'refuse to' are too different to be plausibly attributed to the same particle. But actually the English *He failed to answer my question* is ambiguous between a reading where he made an unsatisfactory answer and another reading where he did not make any answer at all. This shows that the English *fail to* can have a comparable range of meanings.

The uses of *fú* in the oracle bone inscriptions have been studied in Takashima (1973, 1988). More recently, Zhū Qíxiáng (1990:113f.) notes that while a verb negated by *fú* can never be interpreted as passive, verbs followed by *bù* frequently are so construed: a phrase like *fú zhèn* has to mean 'does not shake (the object)', while *bù zhèn* can mean 'is not shaken'.<sup>3</sup>

Moreover in the language of the oracle bones there are interesting restrictions on the position of the object when a verb is negated by *fú*. We frequently have [*bù wǒ* TRANS.-VERB] 'the TRANS-VERB ed me', but apparently we never have [*fú wǒ* TRANS.-VERB].

On the other hand there is no doubt that at this early stage of the Chinese language *fú* is far more frequent than *bù* with verbs that have an explicit object.

As far as I know, the studies of the particle *fú* in Classical Chinese that have been published so far have been based on the printed editions of early texts. Meanwhile it turns out that the *Mǎwángdǎn Lǎozǐ* manuscripts, for example, contain 40 examples of *fú*, versus only two in the editions of Wáng Bì's (226–249 A.D.) commentary and in those editions listed in Shima Kunio (1973). Again, the 79 examples of *fú* I

<sup>2</sup> One factor that sometimes confuses the picture is the stylistic figure of *variatio*: "the semantically non-contrastive free variation between near synonyms for rhetorical effect" where Chinese writers, especially from Han times onwards but also before that time use *fú* instead of *bù* simply for euphonic reasons.

<sup>3</sup> Jìgǔwén héjī (Peking: Zhōngguó shèhuìkēxuéyuán lǐshìyǎnjùsuǒ, 1982), no. 36443 vs. 36427 and 36428.

have collected from the material partly translated by A.T.F. Hulstewé as *Remnants of Ch'in Law*<sup>4</sup> provide a textually reliable testing ground for any interpretation of *fú*. In Herbert Giles' text of the *Sūnzǐ* there is not a single occurrence of the character *fú*. But in the bamboo strip version *Sūnzǐ bīngǎ* (1976:98f.) I find no less than six cases of *fú* on one page of printed text.

*Hudūndǎnzǐ* freely uses *fú*, whereas all the five relevant cases of *fú* in *Guānzǐ* occur on two pages of this voluminous text only. In *Xūnzǐ* there is only one genuine occurrence,<sup>5</sup> the other three being in a quotation from *Shūjīng* and in the spurious last chapter. *Shāngjūnshū* has only two cases of *fú*, both with an explicit object, and both preceding the verb *gǎn* 'dare' (ed. Gāo Héng 1974:141).

Sīmǎ Qiān habitually replaces *fú* by the more current *bù* in adapting from *Zhànguócé* and similar sources, but there are plenty of occurrences of the particle in that book. The usage of *fú* in *Shǐjì* may now be studied in detail in *Shǐjì suǒyǐn* (Peking: Television Publishing Co, 1989).

The complex case of the *Chūnqiūfānlù* is particularly instructive. There are plenty of *fú* in chapters 1 to 5, one case in chapter 25, (ed. Lǎi Yányuán, p. 201) and then suddenly 12 cases in chapter 29 alone. A full treatment of the problems of *fú* in the *Chūnqiūfānlù* will become conveniently possible as soon as D.C. Lau's planned concordance to the book has been published. Here are some striking finds:

慢而弗敬其使者。

'He treated arrogantly and refused to show respect to the emissary.'  
(*Chūnqiūfānlù*, ch. 3, ed. Lǎi, p. 42)<sup>6</sup>

In conversation with the ruler, Gōngsūn Cūō has advised that

<sup>4</sup> Hulstewé (1985), hereafter quoted as *RQL*.

<sup>5</sup> *Xūnzǐ* 3.22.

<sup>6</sup> Cf.:

拒而弗內。

'Keep at a distance and refuse to let in' to be discussed below.

即不用鞅当杀之。

'If [in spite of my recommendation] you do not employ him [i.e. the Lord of Shāng] you ought to kill him.'

But when Gōngsūn Cuō reports his conversation to the Lord of Shāng, he pretends that he has expressed himself in slightly but significantly stronger terms:

即弗用鞅当杀之。

'In spite of my recommendation] you **refuse** to employ him [i.e. the Lord of Shāng] you ought to kill him.' (*Shiji*, ed. Takigawa, 68.3)

One may, of course, disregard the variation between *bù* and *fù* semantically, but it is my submission that the difference is indeed grammatically as well as semantically significant. Gōngsūn Cuō's varying use of negatives is psychologically important.

Throughout the *Chūnqiūfānlù*, *fù* negates deliberate acts of appraisal such as *yú* 'approve as', and also in special cases like the following where *fù* seems on the face of it to have an inanimate subject but looks as if it means 'determine not to':

春秋弗非。

'The Spring and Autumn Annals **refuse** to criticise this.' (*Chūnqiūfānlù* ch. 5, ed. Lài p. 75)

书之者弗予大夫之得立不宜立者也。

'When it writes about it he **refuses** to approve that the grandee got established but ought not to have got established.' (*Chūnqiūfānlù* ch. 4, ed. Lài p. 65)

弗嚼，弗知其旨也。……  
弗论，不知其义也。

'If you **refuse** to chew it, you will **fail** to understand its import. If you **refuse** to discuss it, you will not understand its meaning.' (*Chūnqiūfānlù* ch. 29, ed. Lài p. 227)

The second line shows clearly how *fù* always can be replaced by the unmarked general negative *bù*.

I most heartily agree with Huáng Jīngxīn (1958:10) when he insists

against Ding Shēngshù that Han rewritings like those we find in *Shiji* certainly must not be taken as evidence to prove that there was no *fù* in the original text. Even the absence of *fù* in an ancient text may still be due to a Han taboo rather than pre-Han usage connected with Hân Zhāodi whose name was Liú Fúlíng and who reigned 86 to 74 B.C. In pious deference many texts will have been rewritten to avoid using the character *fù* that unfortunately occurs in his name. In some cases some scrolls compiled into a book may have been rewritten to observe the taboo, others may not have been. In any case, the taboo problem in connection with the emperor Liú Fúlíng greatly complicates our evidence in the sense that it certainly will have led to the removal of a part of our crucial grammatical evidence the size of which it is now hard to determine. Moreover, in principle there is even a possibility of overcompensation for the taboo by later scribes. All this we need to keep in mind when discussing the grammatical particle *fù*.

Like so many other older features, the particle reemerges in the literary and often archaizing *Wénxuān* where I count 98 instances of the particle, whereas in the more colloquial *Shishuó xīnyǔ* there are only two stray cases of the particle.

Let me briefly outline two well-known accounts of *fù* and then argue for a third account which I am arguing for in this paper.

### 1.1. The anaphoric object hypothesis

The anaphoric object hypothesis, argued in detail in Ding Shēngshù (1935), and until today by far the most widely accepted theory, maintains that *fù* is a negative particle incorporating an object particle and corresponding to *bù zhī*. Boodberg (1937) has argued that *fù* is indeed a phonetic fusion of these two morphemes. In the present corpus of texts the attractiveness of this thesis comes out neatly in a very large number of cases, and often even the old commentaries support the reading:

夫人岂以不胜为患哉？弗为耳。

'How would the trouble with such a person be that he cannot manage? It is simply that he refuses to do this.' (*Mengzi* 6B2, ed. Shén, p. 812)

Here Zhào Qí glosses:

但不为之耳。

'He only does not do it, that's all.'

One significant problem for the anaphoric object hypothesis on the etymology of *fú* is the disastrous and well-known fact that the hypothesis does not even begin to provide a plausible explanation for the earliest recorded forms of Chinese, the oracle-bone inscriptions, the older parts of *Shijing*. Whatever the strength of the phonological arguments on reconstructed pronunciations in Boodberg (1937) and elsewhere, the overt and unreconstructed evidence of the pre-classical texts of the oracle bone inscriptions is quite inconsistent with the view that *fú* in these texts is to be understood as a fusion of a negative with an anaphoric object pronoun.

Lǚ Shūxiāng (1955) took account of this historical fact and preferred to speak of *fú* coming to be **felt** to contain a resumptive pronoun in classical Chinese. Huáng Jìngxīn (1958) on the other hand (like Huáng Jìnhóng 1977) felt he had found so much counterevidence even in the later period that he abandoned the attempt to explain *fú* in terms of anaphora altogether.

In some cases there are full nominal objects after the verb negated by *fú*:

始吾敬子。今子鲁囚也。今吾弗敬子矣。

'In the beginning I respected you. Now you are a prisoner of Lǚ. Now I refuse to respect you!' (*Zuǒzhuan*, Duke Zhuāngzǐ 11, Couvreur I: 154)

The co-occurrence of *fú* with final *yí* is interesting and important. As A. C. Graham has pointed out a significantly large number of the neat counterexamples to the anaphoric object hypothesis occur in this pattern. In this pattern *fú* indicates either temporally that a prospect is not realized or logically that something expected to be the case is not.

I shall argue that a simple failure to respect which is not based on a deliberate choice or decision would be *bù jìng*. A decision no longer to respect is *fú jìng*.

夫人情莫不爱其子。今弗爱其子。安能爱君?

'It is in the real nature of man that they invariably love their sons.

Now you **refuse** to show love for your own son. How can you love your ruler?' (*Hánfēizǐ* 36.5.17)

I shall return to this interesting sentence below. At this stage I note that in cases of this sort there is **repetition** of the object. A. C. Graham (1983:64) notes: "Evidently the repetition of verb and object counts as a form of resumption, allowing the use of *fú*." Indeed, there is a parallel sentence of this kind:

令曰：中程者赏，弗中程者诛。

'The order said: those who conform to the rule are to be rewarded. Those who **fail to conform to the rule** are to be executed.' (*Hánfēizǐ* 36.4.44)

As we shall see, what you fail to do in spite of being ordered to do it is often expressed with *fú* 'fail to' because there is a failure to meet an expectation as expressed through the law.

One might add another case of this sort of repetition:

圣人亦弗伤人也。

'The sage too **refuses** to harm men.' (*Lǎozǐ*, Mǎwángdū B, ch. 60)

Note that Mǎwángdū manuscript B has the *rén*, whereas manuscript A omits it. (D. C. Lau fails to mention this reading in his variorum notes. Since there are two cases of *bù shāng rén* in the preceding lines one might explain the intrusion of *rén* in Manuscript B by some kind of scribal laziness, so that one might in the end follow D. C. Lau's reading.)

然民虽有圣知弗敢我谋。

勇力弗敢我杀。

虽众不敢胜其主。

'But even if the common people have supreme knowledge they will **refuse** to take the liberty of plotting against one (i.e. the king).

The courageous and powerful will **refuse** to take the liberty to kill one. Even if they are in a majority they will **not** presume to override one.' (*Shāngjīnshū*, ed. Gāo Héng 1974:141)

The example is in any case uncomfortable for the emphatic hypothesis: The use of the particle *yí* 'also' explicitly indicates that there is no contrast here, and therefore one might be excused for thinking that there can be no question of contrastive stress.

过二月弗置嗇夫...

'If after two months one has **failed** to install an overseer, ...' (*RQL* 106, A99)

Note that the context, as far as we have it, does not suggest an resumptive '(install an overseer) for it', but the phrase *zhī sèfū* does occur in the context.

人固买。子小不可别。弗卖子母谓也。

'Others would surely buy them, but the children are small and should not be separated (from their mother). So this refers to the fact that one **refuses** to sell the child's mother.' (*RQL* 201, D 96)

Note that here there is no specific customer in the context. We cannot read 'refuses to sell the mother to him'. Here the refusal to sell the mother on her own is exactly what the law requires. This refusal does not conform with the generally predominant pattern in the *Remnants of Qin law*.

徒吏与偕使而弗为私舍人...

'Men and officials who accompany the mission and who **fail** to qualify as (or act as) private retainers...' (*RQL* 229, D159)

甘茂不善於公而弗为公言。

'Gān Mào was not well-disposed toward the Duke and **refused** to speak up in favour of the Duke.' (*Zhāngguócé*, Han 1.20, ed. Zhū Zūgēng, p. 1400)

适弗逢世...

'If by chance he **fails** to meet the right generation...' (*Lǐjī*, Rùxíng, ed. Couvreur II: 607)

*Feng shì* is here understood as something one can try to do. *Fú* converts a verb that would not normally be construed as involving an action, a trying into such a verb of trying.

The current notion that *fú* incorporates an object *zhī* can only be maintained if one assumes a pervasive tendency towards redundancy, because as is well known, the *zhī* which is supposed to be incorporated in *fú* is often repeated immediately after *fú*. Compare the German *Ich gehe mit ihm mit* 'I'll go along with him'.

大国亦弗之从。

'The great states will also refuse to follow it.' (*Mòzǐ* 18.22)

翟闻之言义而弗行是犯明也。

绰非弗之知也。稼胜义也。

'I have heard it said that as to speaking of duty but **refusing** to act it out, it is clear that such behaviour is contrary to rule. It is not that Chuò **failed** to recognize this. It is a matter of emoluments winning over duty.' (*Mòzǐ* 49.84)

亡则弗之忘矣。

'When they are deceased, then one **refuses** to forget them (i.e. one's parents).' (*Lǐjī*, Tāngōng 1.9, Couvreur I: 116)<sup>7</sup>

*Shìcānjīng zhùshù* p. 1275, middle, confirms our reading. I shall claim that *fú* transforms what might otherwise be an incidental, involuntary thing to do (forgetting) into a voluntary negative verb phrase: 'refuse to forget, i.e. keep in mind'.

君子曰：无节於内者，观物弗之察矣。

欲察物而不由礼，弗之得矣。

故作事不以礼，弗之敬矣。

出言不以礼，弗之信矣。

'The gentleman says: "If you have no restraint within, then if you look at things you will **fail** to see them clearly."

If you want to see things clearly and you do not follow ritual, then you will **fail** to get hold of them.

Therefore if in going about business you do not act according to ritual, people will **refuse** to respect you.

If you utter words not in accordance with ritual, people will **refuse** to put their faith in them (or: you).'" (*Lǐjī*, Lǐqì, ed. *Shìcānjīng zhùshù* p. 1440, fr. Couvreur II: 651)

<sup>7</sup> For a related *fú wàng* 'refuse to forget them', see *Lǐjī*, ed. *Shìcānjīng zhùshù* p. 1598 bottom. Cf. also *Chūcǐ*, Chénjiāng, ed. SBBY 13.2b: 后世祚而弗忘。

<sup>8</sup> Later generations praised him and refused to forget him.'

What is negated by *fú* is something that one may try to do, not something that one just happens to come to do. The non-main four negatives are *bù*. One could also try to read them as 'fail to' or as 'refuse to' but the Chinese does not force us into such an interpretation.

秦王以公孙郝为党於公而弗之听。

'The King of Qin considered Gōngsūn Hǎo a partisan of the Duke and refused to listen to him. (*Zhànguóè*, Hàn 1.20, ed. Zhū Zǔgēng p. 1400)<sup>8</sup>

If I understand the semantics of *fú zhī tīng* the phrase could never mean 'he did not hear of it'.<sup>9</sup>

The standard idiom is *fú tīng* 'refuse to listen':

孟尝君将入秦。止者千数而弗听。

'Mèngchángjūn was about to invade Qín. Those who (tried to) dissuade him were in the thousands, but he refused to/would not follow their advice.' (*Zhànguóè*, Qín 3.3, ed. Zhū, p. 564)

A definitely late example might be added as a curiosity:

奕弗之疑。

'Xie Yi did not have suspicions about it.' (*Shishuo xinyu* 24.8, ed. Yǎng Yōng, p. 580)

At this point neither refusal nor 'failing to' seem to be involved. *Fú* has lost its idiomatic force. The case is interesting: as far as I know *fú yí* is unattested in pre-Han literature. If I found the phrase, it would constitute neat counterevidence against the paraphrase 'refuse to, fail to' as I understand it, unless that is the context should make it plausible that what is involved is a deliberate decision not to have doubts about something. This would seem to be a very difficult psychological feat indeed.

<sup>8</sup> Huang Jingxin (1958:12, nos. 49 and 50) provides two additional examples from the *Zhōulì*.

<sup>9</sup> Compare 不肯听辨.

<sup>10</sup> You were unwilling to listen to Biàn.' (*Zhànguóè*, Qi 1.5, ed. Zhū, p. 480)

In some cases we have *bù* without an object and *fú* followed by *zhī*:  
背叛之人，贤主弗内之於朝，君子不与交友。

'As for a person bent on revolution, the talented ruler will refuse to (for an explanation of this gloss for *fú* see below) admit him into the court, and the gentleman does not<sup>10</sup> cultivate friendship with him.' (*Lǚshìhūngūi* 4.3, ed. Chén p. 206)

*Xúnzi* provides a parallel with *bù* instead of *fú* but without the object pronoun *zhī*:

倍畔之人，明君不内朝，士大夫迁诸涂不与言。

'As for a recalcitrant person, the enlightened ruler does not admit him to his court, and the knight does not speak to him when he meets him in the street.' (*Xúnzi* 27.85)

Quite often, the verb negated by *fú* is followed by *zhī* which is supposed to be present already in the *fú*. This is well known and does not, perhaps, need detailed documentation at this stage.

My intuition is that there is more to *fú* than just its connection with transitivity. The question is exactly what?

## 1.2. The emphatic hypothesis

Pulleblank (1978) attacked the anaphoric object hypothesis and pointed out what he saw as a host of counter examples which proved it fundamentally wrong. Pulleblank proposed instead that *fú* should be seen as an emphatic negative particle often incorporating some kind of contrastive emphasis: "The primary function of the *fu-sheng* negatives in -*t* seems to be ... to give relative prominence to the fact of negation rather than to what is negated".<sup>11</sup> Let me call this the emphatic hypothesis.

The emphatic hypothesis is entirely compatible with the anaphoric

<sup>10</sup> *Fú* would have been perfectly acceptable for *bù* in this context.

<sup>11</sup> Op. cit., p. 118. Pulleblank has abandoned this hypothesis in his forthcoming contribution to the *Festschrift* for A. C. Graham.

object hypothesis: one can imagine that *fú* is both emphatic and etymologically contains an object pronoun.

There is some late glossographic evidence which might be taken to support the hypothesis that *fú* is an emphatic negative to which Pulleyblank has drawn attention:

弗者不之深也。

'*Fú* is a deeper form of *bù*.' (Hé Xiū (129–182 A.D.) on *Gōngyángzhuàn*, Duke Huán 10.3 and Duke Xi 26.2, ed. *Sihüehiyáo* 5.4a and 12.3b)

By the time of Hé Xiū the distinction between *bù* and *fú* had changed character, of course. But Hé Xiū's intuition is important to take into account.

Here, however, is a standard case where emphasis on the negation seems out of the question:

谓公叔曰：乘舟舟漏而弗塞，则舟沈矣...

'He said to Gōngshū: "When, as you are riding a boat, that boat is leaking and you **refuse (fail)** to block (the hole), then the boat will sink. ..." (*Zhānguócé*, Hǎn 2.8, ed. Zhū, p. 1429)

The natural emphasis, if any, is on the verb, or on the whole negated verb phrase. Contrastive stress on the negation alone in such very ordinary cases would be misleading. Of course, one can point out that 'not blocking' here is understood as being in contrast with 'blocking'. But *this* form of contrastiveness will apply to strictly all negations and can therefore not be used to distinguish between them.

Mere emphasis without contrastive stress on the negation is too elusive and subjective a notion to provide any testable and objective grammatical criterion. The thesis that *fú* involves this elusive kind of emphasis remains ultimately unrefutable and to that extent quite uninteresting. In short, Popper's principle of falsifiability is useful in grammar as elsewhere. Grammatical theories are sound and important to the extent that they clearly risk objective refutation but happen to survive such efforts at refutation.

The fusion theory is a good theory in so far as it runs a neat risk of clear refutation: it is clear what counts as an exception. The theory that *fú* is an emphatic negative is a poor theory in so far as it fails to specify

exactly what would count as refutation and thus runs no sporting risk of objective refutation. (It will necessarily go forever unrefuted. Not because it is true, but because it is insufficiently substantial to admit of decisive refutation.)

The present paper is an attempt to argue for an alternative account which tries to avoid the conclusion in Huang Jinhóng (1977) that there is no grammatical distinction between *bù* and *fú* and that the only reason why we see *bù* more often than *fú* is that the latter takes more strokes to write.

### 1.3. An alternative proposal: the refusal hypothesis

I wish to argue in some detail that *fú* in the texts here under discussion is used to make negative phrases which involve a failure to do something which is due to the subject and not just to external circumstances.

My claim is that [*fú* + VERB] may consistently be glossed and understood as 'refuse to VERB the object', 'be unwilling to VERB the object', 'abstain from VERBING the object', 'decide not to VERB the object', 'be unable to VERB the object', 'fail to VERB the object', where characteristically (but *not* always) the object of the transitive verb that follows *fú* is understood rather than expressed.

Consider the interaction of the negatives in the following:

父母之喪，弗除可乎？

孔子曰：先王制禮，過時弗舉，禮也。非弗能勿除也。患其過於制也。

'When mourning for one's father and mother, is it acceptable to **refuse** to discontinue the mourning (after the prescribed period is over)?' Confucius said: "The former kings established the ritual rule that after the proper period one must **refuse** to carry (the ritual) out. That is the ritual rule.

It is not as if one **failed** to be able to avoid discontinuing (the mourning). The thing is that one is concerned about offending against established rule." (*Liji*, *Zēngzǐ wèn*, ed. Couvreur I: 446)

One notes that the object pronoun is here incorporated into two separate negations.

The possibility of glosses such as those I have suggested by itself, however, is a treacherous criterion. The semantic crux is this: *fú* never

negates what is construed as an entirely involuntary action of the subject which is only due to external circumstances.

In some cases one has to extend the notion of deliberateness, but this is only natural. One would, for example, not hesitate to agree that 'refuse to' involves deliberateness. But as we shall have occasion to note below, a newspaper heading like "Sums that refuse to sum up" is a perfectly acceptable English way of personalising the sums, and the possibility of such occasional extension of the pattern does not vitiate the principle that 'refuse to' is basically something deliberate to do.

According to what I call the refusal hypothesis *fú* does typically incorporate an object, and it does typically transform what otherwise might be an intransitive verb that follows it into a transitive verb. When we see *fú guì* we do not translate 'fail to be valuable' but rather 'refuse to treat as valuable'. Here is an instructive instance where this grammatical decision becomes relevant:

夫玉生於山，制則破焉。  
非弗宝贵矣。然夫璞不完。

'Precious stones grow in the mountains. When you treat them you do damage to them. It is not that we fail/refuse to value or appreciate them. But their integrity is less than complete.' (*Zhāngguóè*, Qí 4.5, ed. Zhū p. 609<sup>12</sup>)

However, *fú* may turn out to incorporate an anaphoric object not in the way of *rán* which in some sense *always* corresponds to *rú zhī* and would appear to be a fusion with the reconstructed pronoun \**an* which also is a part of *yān* (which corresponds to *yú zhī*). *Fú* may in the relevant respect be somewhat like *yí* 'use, using, by, using it, by it, with it', which typically may incorporate an (implicit) anaphoric object but which often does govern an explicit object, and which remarkably often does govern the explicit object *zhī*.

One typical observation to support my interpretation is the ubiquitousness of *fú dé* 'fail to get or achieve it' for which there must be

<sup>12</sup> Zhū emends his text on the basis of a later quotation in a commentary to *Hànshū*. Miào Wényuán (1987:400) and Fēng Zuómín (1983:322) are properly conservative and retain the main features of the textus receptus. J. L. Crump (1970:163) translates: "Jade is found in the mountains and only when worked does it flaw. The final product is still valuable but its pristine wholeness is lost."

hundreds of examples versus the rarity of *fú shí*. Note that one fails to get or achieve what one is trying to get or achieve. We expect and find *qiú ér fú dé* 'seek but fail to obtain it'.<sup>13</sup> We have *zhūí ér fú jí* 'follow after but fail to reach'.<sup>14</sup> *Fú jí* 'fail to reach it' is common elsewhere.<sup>15</sup>

Compare again the very common occurrence of *fú shòu* 'refuse to accept' (e.g. *Zhāngguóè*, Chū 4.5, ed. Zhū, p. 832 et passim) versus the remarkable scarcity of *fú shí* '\*\*fail to lose'. What we do get is *wù shí* 'avoid losing it'. *Shí zhī* 'lose it' is common in *Lǎozǐ*.<sup>16</sup> Particularly interesting is the combination *wù shí zhī* meaning 'make sure not to lose it' in *Xúnzǐ* 17.46. *Bù shí* 'not lose it' is also common.<sup>17</sup> In *Hànshū* *wáizhuàn* 4.11 we have a parallelism between *bù shí* 'not get it (the business) wrong' and *fú ē* 'refuse to flatter him'.

If we did find a case of *fú shí* the present account predicts that the meaning would have to be 'refuse to let go of'. This is indeed the meaning I do find in the exceptional cases. I line up all the cases I have managed to find:

子曰：回之为人也，择乎中庸，  
得一善则拳拳服膺而弗失之。

'The Master said: "This was the manner of Hui: he made choice of the Mean and whenever he got hold of what was good, he clasped it firmly, as if wearing in on his breast, and refused to let go of it."' (*Lǐjī*, *Zhōngyōng*, ch. 8, ed. *Shìcānjīng zhushū*, p. 1626)

James Legge translates the last phrase: "... and did not lose it" thus missing the point of this particular moral exercise. Couvreur p. 32 translates correctly both in the Latin and in the French: "... et ne la

<sup>13</sup> *Mèngzǐ* 7B30.

<sup>14</sup> *Lǐjī*, Wēnsàng ed, Couvreur II: 554.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. *Zhāngguóè*, Qí 3.6, ed. Zhū, p. 573; *Bōshū wúxingpiān*, ed. Páng pp. 51.52; *Chūcí*, Yuǎnyóu, ed. SBBY 5.2a.

<sup>16</sup> *Lǎozǐ* 3.2, 29.2, 64.4; *Mèngzǐ* 2A1, 6A6, 7A3; *Xúnzǐ* 3.33, 4.21, etc. The combination occurs sixteen times in *Xúnzǐ* alone.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *Lǎozǐ* 73.2, also in *Xúnzǐ* 12.24, 27.82; *Lǎoshì chūnqū* 10.4; *Hànqǐzǐ* 8.6.23, 25.4.4; *Guānzǐ* 2.101-4, 2.67-5, 1.47-10, 1.18-6, 1.9-7, 1.46-3, 2.67-13.



laissez plus échapper.” The ambition of the present grammatical account is that it should *force* us to make the correct interpretation of such passages.

故执之而弗失。  
亲之而弗离。

‘Therefore he will hold on to it and **refuse** to let go of it.

He will keep close to it and **refuse** to be separated from it.’ (*Bóshū wúxīngpiàn* (copied after 207 B.C. and before 195 B.C.) ed. Páng, p. 85)

Our grammatical point is again of significance for the following:

圣人不能为时，时至弗失。

‘The sage is unable to create the right moment. But when the right moment arrives he **refuses** to let it pass.’ (*Zhànguócé*, Qín 3.2, ed. Zhū p. 264)

Note that you do not become and remain a sage by luck. The sage must have ‘a way’ of doing things. There must be something deliberate about his not missing the right moment.

Another symptomatic case is the common *fú zhī* ‘fail to understand it, fail to recognise it’. We do have *wú huò zhī* ‘I am confused about it’<sup>18</sup> and *bù huò* ‘not be confused (about it)’.<sup>19</sup> In *Zhuāngzǐ* 28.15

岂不惑哉。

we should probably translate ‘How should they not be confused about this?’ A pathological state like that of confusion is not negatable by *fú*. In any case, we never have, as far as I have been able to ascertain, *fú huò* ‘\*refuse to be confused about it’. If I found an instance, I would expect the context to encourage me to read: ‘refuse to allow oneself to get confused by it’.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *Zuózhuan*, Duke Huán 15.4; *Guoyǔ*, ed. Shijieshūjū 5.4b, *Hánfēizi* 34.15.5.

<sup>19</sup> *Xūnzi* 5.37, 12.25 and 28.39; *Zhuāngzǐ* 10.28.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. a possible case in *fú mí* ‘refuse to be led astray by’ in *Bóshū wúxīngpiàn*, ed. Páng, p. 65.

On the other hand we do have

过而弗悔。

‘When they missed the mark they **refused** to regret it.’ (*Zhuāngzǐ* 6.5)

to be compared to ‘How do I know that the dead **do not** regret (*bù huì*) that in the beginning they sought life?’ (*Zhuāngzǐ* 2.81)

We have phrases like

相类而非。

‘(Things often) are alike but are not the same.’ (*Zhànguócé*, ed. Zhū, p. 1139)

where *lèi* clearly is a transitive verb. In cases like

不可类之。

‘They cannot be made to resemble them (dogs and horses).’ (*Hánfēizi* 32.18.12)

one might object that this is a special derived use of *lèi* which cannot be used to demonstrate that the word is a transitive verb. But consider this:

辞多类非而是，多类是而非。

‘Many formulations look wrong but are right, many look right but are wrong.’ (*Lǚshìchūnqiū* 22.6)

秦类之。

‘Qin is of this sort.’ (*Xūnzi* 16.67, cf. 21.84)

We also have *bù lèi* ‘not be like it, not be of the same kind as it’ (*Zuó-zhuan*, Duke Zhuāng 8.5),<sup>21</sup> but not *fú lèi* ‘\*refuse to be of the same kind as it’ in the concordanced pre-Han texts. According to the present hypothesis we should never find this combination.  
We have

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *Mòjīng* A 87, A.C.Graham 1987:334; Graham considers that *bù lèi* in *Mòjīng* must be taken to mean ‘not be alike’.

似之而非也

'be like it but not (really) be it'<sup>22</sup>

and

物之相似

'things' being like each other'<sup>23</sup>

and there is no doubt about the transitivity of *si*:

信陵君似之矣。

'The ruler of Xin Ling resembled this.' (Xūnzi 13.48)

*Si* may be also be negated:

望之不似人君

'When you look at him from a distance he does not look like a ruler of men.' (Mèngzǐ 1A6; cf. Zhuāngzǐ 17.10 and 17.11, 17.12, 17.14)

According to the present account we should not get *fú sī* '\*\*refuse to be like' because the word cannot be construed as an action verb. Indeed, we never seem to get this combination in the indexed pre-Han literature at least.

On the other hand we do have *fú ruò* 'fail to come up to' e.g. in Mèngzǐ 6A9 (two examples to be discussed below), and *fú rú* 'fail to come up to'.<sup>24</sup> One may ask

其与是不类乎。

'Is that not of the same kind?' (Zhuāngzǐ 2.48)

<sup>22</sup> Lǚshìchūnqiū, p. 605; Zhuāngzǐ 20.5 and 27.3; Zhànguóè, Wèi 1.4, ed. Zhū p. 1139.

<sup>23</sup> Lǚshìchūnqiū 22.3, 22.6 (two examples).

<sup>24</sup> E.g. in Zhànguóè, ed. Zhū, p. 360 (two examples), and *ibidem* p. 450; Sīnbìn bīngǎ, ed. Zhāng, p. 188 (three examples). Cf. also Huánánzǐ, ed. Liú 18.22a (three examples).

According to our account we should not ordinarily expect *fú huó* to mean anything like 'he is not alive'. So when we see a phrase like

子之先生死矣。弗活矣。

this should *not* mean 'your master is dead, he is not alive'. Indeed we find that this passage refers to the master of Lièzǐ. This master is highly alive but, according to a wizard, he is doomed to die. The wizard tells Lièzǐ about the prospects for his master: "Your master is a dead man. He will fail to survive [this]." (Zhuāngzǐ 7.20, cf. tr. A.C. Graham 1984:97).

We have the famous *wú sàng wǒ* 'I have lost myself',<sup>25</sup> but if we ever found *fú sàng* my prediction is that this would come to mean something like 'refused to bury him' rather than 'did not lose it'. We commonly find *fú yǐng* 'refuse to respond to it' and never *fú gǎn* '\*\*refuse to affect it'. We have

感而后应。

'Only after moved (by something) will he (i.e. the sage) respond (to it)'. (Zhuāngzǐ 15.11)

In reporting a strange experience Zhuāngzǐ illustrates the transitive nature of *gǎn*:

异鹤感吾颞。

'A peculiar magpie brushed against my forehead.' (Zhuāngzǐ 20.67)

We commonly find *guài zhī* 'be amazed at it',<sup>26</sup> but we never find *fú guài* '\*\*refuse to be amazed at it'. *Bù yǔ* is 'not to chance upon, not to happen to meet',<sup>27</sup> *yǔ zhī* is 'to happen to meet it/him'.<sup>28</sup> We never

<sup>25</sup> Zhuāngzǐ 2.3.

<sup>26</sup> Zhuāngzǐ 6.76 etc.

<sup>27</sup> Zhuāngzǐ 19.65f, three examples.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. Zhuāngzǐ 19.60.

get *fú yǔ* ‘\*refuse/fail to happen to meet him/it’ except in an inscrutable entry of the *Yijing*.<sup>29</sup>

If we were to find the construction *fú fēng* we would predict that this could not refer just to the absence of any chance meeting, but has to refer to a meeting one was looking for but that did not materialize, as is indeed the case in the sage’s meeting with a properly receptive world *fú fēng shì*.<sup>30</sup> This sort of case is marginal in so far as the failure to meet is due to chance (*shì*) and not to any lack of effort or ability.

We have *wù zhī* ‘hate him’<sup>31</sup> but rarely, as far as I can see, *fú wù*. In *Zhāngguócé* (ed. Zhū, p. 85), we first learn that

韩魏必恶之。

‘Hán and Wèi are bound to take exception to/resent it (i.e. Chū).’

and then contrasting with this we have

若四国弗恶

‘if the four states fail/refuse to take exception to it (i.e. Chū).’

The contrastiveness of *fú* is, of course, exactly as predicted by Pulleyblank. But there is no reason to attribute the contrastive force to *fú* itself.

We have

畏之如雷霆。

‘They will fear him like bursts of thunder.’ (*Zuózhuan*, Duke Xiang fu 3)

but if we found *fú wèi*, we would read this as ‘refused to allow oneself to be scared by’.

弗畏强禦果也。

‘To refuse to be scared by strongmen is determination.’ (*Bóshū wǎnxīngpiān*, ed. Páng p. 65. Cf. also *ibidem* p. 58)

<sup>29</sup> Under hexagram 62, ed. Harvard Yenching Index Series p. 38.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *Liji*, *Rúxíng*, ed. Couvreur II: 607.

<sup>31</sup> *Zuózhuan*, Duke Yin 1.3.

We have *bù jù* ‘not be frightened by it’<sup>32</sup> but apparently never *fú jù* ‘\*refuse to be frightened’. We have *nù wǒ* ‘get angry with me’<sup>33</sup> but I have yet to hunt down an instance of *fú nù*.

圣人羞之。

means ‘the sage will be ashamed of it’ (*Zhuāngzǐ* 12.80)

but do we ever get *fú xiū*? *Xiū zhī* is ‘smell it’<sup>34</sup> but do we ever have *fú xiū* ‘\*refuse to smell it’?

We do not expect passive constructions with *wéi* to be negated with *fú*. If we did find such a passive construction, I would predict that such a construction must have a very special meaning: the grammatical subject of the construction must somehow refuse to be verbed by the logical subject. This is exactly what happens in the one such instance that I have found:

申专 (w. 乡 radical) 者大臣弗与。百姓弗为用。故王胜之。

‘As for Shen Zhuan, the senior ministers refuse to associate with him; the citizens refused to allow themselves to be employed by him, and therefore you will win over him.’ (*Zhāngguócé*, Qí 1.1, ed. Zhū p. 470).

At first sight the present example looks like a very nasty demonstration of the limitations of current analyses of *fú*, but on closer examination it turns out just this sort of examples shows the crucial semantic force of *fú* most clearly. In defence of the resumptive object hypothesis one might insist that a pseudo-object of *wéi* is understood. After all we could have *bù wéi X yòng* ‘was not used by X’.

As a result of the above persuasion the King of Chū decided that he would not send the man away *fú zhū zhī*, something which the king had originally planned to do.<sup>35</sup>

Examples could be multiplied. My point is that they do fall into a

<sup>32</sup> *Zhuāngzǐ* 17.64.

<sup>33</sup> *Zuózhuan*, Duke Huan 10 fu 2.

<sup>34</sup> *Zhuāngzǐ* 4.78.

<sup>35</sup> *Zhāngguócé*, Qí 1.1, ed. Zhū p. 470.

neat pattern: what is not construed as deliberate or as depending on the actor rather than the circumstances cannot on **that reading** be negated by *fú*. However, I must here report an instance which despite appearances is less than comfortable for the present account:

喜怒哀恨愛惡欲，七者弗學而能。

'Pleasure, anger, sadness, fear, love, hate, desire: these seven things we fail to study but are capable of.' (*Lǚjī*, Lǚyùn, ed. *Shānsūnjīng zhūshū*, p. 1422, bottom)

The fact that we can translate 'fail to' here just glosses over the fact that this failure is not the failure to achieve what one has been trying to do. The failure to do something one is expected to do in a wider sense (like having learnt something which one is capable of) can be marked by *fú*.

It is important to keep in mind that the possibility of smuggling a 'refuse to' or a 'fail to' into the translations of verb phrases with *fú* by itself proves very little. The semantic test is the deliberateness or at least the quasi-deliberateness of the action denied.

In translating *fú* by verbs I am aware that I will have offended many grammatical sensibilities. But this convention of translation is not essential to my point. The essence of the matter is not the verbality in the translation but the modal or semantic nuance. I note in any case that even if *fú* were to be interpreted as a grammaticalized verb it would have to be described as a highly "deficient" grammaticalized verb - to use the terminology of Latin grammar. *Fú* can take no adverbs, it cannot be negated, it can take no nominal object, and so on. The test of my hypothesis is not whether it turns out that we can abstractly and theoretically argue for the quintessential verbality of *fú* or not. The test is whether it turns out to be helpful in the interpretation of ancient Chinese texts to regularly gloss *fú* by such English verbs as 'to refuse to, to abstain from, to fail to, etc.'

The theoretical question whether a highly specialized negation of this sort ultimately should be called a verb or has to be called a particle is 'academic' in the sense of being for my present purposes insubstantial. I shall therefore *not* spend any time at all arguing for the verbality versus particle-nature of *fú*, just as I shall *not* join the extended learned (and necessarily speculative) discussion concerning the likely etymology of the particle. Instead, I shall devote all my attention to the question of how *in practice* one should best gloss the negation *fú* in the various contexts

in which it occurs in order to capture what appears to be the precise and subtle force of the word in those pragmatic, semantic, and syntactic surroundings. The test is simply whether or not my gloss does or does not help to clarify the sentences in which *fú* occurs. The reader can decide for himself to what extent they do on the basis of the documentation provided.

Now when you refuse to or fail to do something it is typically expected that you should do it, as when you refuse to say hello (to someone). Thus the scope of the negative verbs like 'refuse' often tends to be something that is known in the context. When the 'main' verb is transitive, the object is often known. According to classical Chinese grammar what is known can be omitted, so this object we would expect to be omitted, especially if it is the pronoun *zhī*. But this syntactic peculiarity (whether motivated by etymology or mistaken folk etymology of ancient times) is not necessarily the whole story about the semantic function of *fú* in classical Chinese.

When you refuse or fail to do something this is often (though not always) in contrast with what other people do manage to do, as when you refuse or fail to turn up at a meeting. Thus there often (but not always) is contrastiveness involved in a failure or a refusal to do something. But this contrastiveness or emphasis is not necessarily the whole story about the semantic function of the particle.

Consider this:

弗为也。

'He will refuse to do it.' (*Mengzi* 3B1, Shén p. 414)

Here Zhào Qí glosses *fú* as *bù yù* which is pretty close to the gloss I am arguing for in this paper. I sympathize with D. C. Lau's translation of this passage: "He would still rather not do it." Zhào Qí's gloss here is suggestive, but evidently it fails to qualify as incontrovertible evidence that he understood *fú* generally to have the meaning *bù yù*. One might plausibly argue that Zhào Qí based his gloss on the context rather than the meaning of *fú*. Indeed plain *bù wéi* by itself often comes to mean *bù yù wéi*. My point is that *bù wéi* does not *have to* mean this, that it is *unmarked* for the relevant distinctive feature, that it *could* mean 'he happened not to do it'.

Compare:

令曰为之，弗为，是谓废法也。

'When the order tells you to do something and you **refuse (fail) to do it**, then that is called failing to carry out the law.' (RQL 212, D120)

Clearly, the anaphoric object hypothesis has no problem with this, and yet it seems to me that my gloss brings out an important additional nuance. In most instances my account should be seen as complementary to the anaphoric object hypothesis rather than as being in competition with it.

In any case we should not fail to note that we also have similar examples which for the anaphoric object hypothesis are less than comfortable:

子曰：素（read 索）隍行怪，後世有迷焉，吾弗为之矣。

'The Master said: Seeking out obscure things and performing amazing deeds so that later generations have something to speak of: I refuse to do this.' (Liji, Zhōngyōng, ed. *Shìsānjīng zhùshǔ*, p. 1626, bottom<sup>36</sup>)

Here is another text where the old commentary seems to support my gloss:

目之情欲色。  
心弗乐五色在前弗视。

'It is in the nature of the eye that it desires colours. If the mind **refuses (or: fails?) to take pleasure in them**, then even if the five colours are in front of one, one **refuses to look at them**.' (*Lǐshìchūnqū* 5.4, ed. Chen p. 272)<sup>37</sup>

Here Gāo Yòu glosses *fū shì* as

不欲视之也。

This, again, is consistent with the anaphoric object hypothesis and it also lends support to the account presented in this paper. The fact that in some contexts we understand *bù jiàn* as 'does not wish to see/visit' does not affect our point. My claim is that we do not for grammatical reasons

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Zhū Xi, *Sìshū jǐzhū*, ed. Chángshā 1985, p.37.

<sup>37</sup> There are two exactly parallel sentences in the context.

*have to understand bù jiàn in this way. I maintain that the phrase is unmarked for the nuance here at issue. The proof of this is simple enough: bù jiàn in other contexts often has to be understood as 'not to see' as in bù jiàn ér míng 'being enlightened without seeing'.*<sup>38</sup>

Again I find:

呼尔而与之，行道之人弗受。

'When these (the rice and the soup) are given with abuse, a passer-by in the street will **refuse to accept them**.' (*Mèngzǐ* 6A10, Shen p. 784; cf. *Mèngzǐ* 7A34 and *Jīngfǎ* p. 71)

Zhào Qí's gloss corresponds to mine: *bù kěn shòu* 'he is unwilling to accept it', although one must keep in mind that Zhào Qí nowhere defines *fū bù kěn yě* 'fū means 'not to be willing to' " and that his gloss here is simply due to the context. But similar objections might be raised against all glosses in early commentaries. They explain not abstractly the meaning of a word or expression as such, but the meaning of that word or expression in a given context. The idiom *fú shòu* 'refuse to accept' is ubiquitous in pre-Han literature.<sup>39</sup> Accepting is like giving, listening to, obeying, replying, paying attention to: these are things which one naturally might refuse to do. And here comes the crux: what one refuses or fails to do is always construed as something voluntary. What is negated by *fū* in classical Chinese tends to be something that one might hope to do or fear to do. It is never some state such as that of being deaf, dumb or blind, although it can occasionally be an action like standing up. If a verb meaning something like 'be stupid' were found to be preceded by *fú* I maintain that we would have to read this as 'refuse to consider (someone) as stupid' etc. In other words, the use of *fú* affects the way we read the verb that follows it. It forces us to read these verbs as action verbs or quasi-action verbs, just as the English verb 'refuse to, fail to' ordinarily forces us to find a complement of this sort when the verb is transitive.

However, we find derived uses of 'refuse' as in the caption: "Sums

<sup>38</sup> *Hánfēnzǐ* 21.18.39.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. e.g. *Zhànguócé*, Dōng Zhōu 7, ed. Zhū p. 21 for two examples.

that **refuse to add up**."<sup>40</sup> The sums ought to add up. But they don't. They refuse to. In English, some people might say that certain kinds of *fú* 'refuse to behave as they should according to the hypothesis proposed in this essay': This shows that the English verb 'refuse to' has certain derived meanings in which the original pregnant meaning of the word (and its selection restrictions) are weakened. I think something of this sort happens when we have to translate *fú* as 'fail to' etc.: but the crucial point that a refusal and a failure to do something have in common is clear enough. In both cases there is an obvious expectation, and that expectation is not met. The difference is that it is not met for diametrically opposed reasons. In one case because the agent did not wish to meet the expectation, and in the other because he, wanting to meet the expectation, was unable to live up to it. This bifurcation of the meaning of *fú* remains puzzling, but it is an ordinary phenomenon in natural language polysemy.

禹之时十年九潦，而水弗为加益。  
汤之时八年七旱，而崖不为加损。

'At the time of Yu there were floods in nine out of ten years, but the waters **refused to rise** on this account.

At the time of Tang there were droughts in seven out of eight years, but the shores never receded.' (*Zhuāngzi* 17.73)

Here is an example from a logical text:

趋之而得刀则弗趋也  
是以所疑止所欲也。

'If by heading for it you could get money, then **refusing to head** for it would be taking the doubt as grounds for fixing which you prefer.' (A.C. Graham's translation; *Mojing* A75)<sup>41</sup>

One must point out that *suǒ yí* certainly is not 'the doubt (i.e. the psychological process of doubting)' but 'what one is doubtful about (i.e. the matter which is in doubt)'; but as far as his translation of the particle *fú* is concerned I obviously sympathize with Graham's version.

<sup>40</sup> *The Economist*, June 24, 1989, p. 17.

<sup>41</sup> The translation is taken from A.C. Graham (1987:321), but emphasis, of course, is mine.

凡重，上弗挈，下弗收，旁弗劫，则下直。

'Speaking generally of heavy objects, if one **fails to pull** them up from above, if one **fails to receive** them from below, and if one **fails to force** it from the side, then their going down will be straight.' (*Mojing* B27; contrast the translation in A.C. Graham 1978:393)

My account here would force me to insist that the Mohist construes the possible interference with the natural vertical falling process as deliberate, as an action.

In his bilingual Hong Kong edition of 1982, D. C. Lau has drawn attention to the problem of *fú* in *Lǎozǐ*. A. F. P. Hulsewé's *RQL*, on the other hand, acknowledges a debt to Pulleyblank's new interpretation of *fú* as an emphatic negative.

Let me now turn to a detailed and complete survey of *fú* in the *Lǎozǐ* against the background of selected passages from the selected other sources.

## 2. *Fú* in the Mǎwángdūnī texts of *Lǎozǐ*

There is a large set of examples with *fú* where (contrary to Pulleyblank's suggestion) the contrastive stress has to be on the verbs rather than on the negation:

是以圣人为而弗有。  
成功而弗居也。

'Therefore the sage acts but **refuses to be possessive** (about what he does). He achieves but **refuses to possess** (what he achieves).' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 77; cf. also *Jīngfǎ* p. 91)

D. C. Lau emends this text (without arguing for the emendation in any detail) to read:

为而弗恃

and translates: 'The sage benefits them yet exacts no gratitude.' He thus introduces a pronoun where the text has none, and omits it where in theory he claims it has to be understood.

The contrastive stress, if any, would be on the verbs *yǒu* and *jù*. These are the words that are being contrasted.

*Yǒu zhī* is a current idiom for 'there is such a state of affairs'. But *fú* *yǒu* cannot ever mean anything like 'there is no such state of affairs'.

生而弗有也。  
为而弗恃也。  
长而弗宰也。  
此之谓玄德。

'(The Way) gives birth but **refuses** to be possessive about things.

It works for them but **refuses** to exact gratitude from them.

It lets things grow but **refuses** to exercise authority over them.

This is called mysterious power.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 51)

Note that the object is as absent after the transitive verbs *shēng* 'give birth to', *wèi* 'work on behalf of', and *zhǎng* 'let grow' as it is after the equally transitive verbs *yǒu* 'claim possession of', *shì* 'exact gratitude from (?)', and *zài* 'exercise authority over'.

Contrastive stress, if any, is not on the *fú*. The contrast is between *shēng* and *yǒu*, between *wèi* and *shì*, between *zhǎng* and *zài*. Examples of this sort are remarkably common:

生之，畜之。  
生而弗有。  
长而弗宰。  
是谓玄德。

'It gives life to them, nourishes them.

It gives life but **refuses** to claim ownership.

It fosters up but **refuses** to claim authority.

This is called the mysterious virtue.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 10)

使秦弗有而失天下。

'Cause Qin to fail to take possession of it (i.e. the city she is besieging) and to lose the empire.' (*Zhànguócé* 3.12, ed. Zhu p. 586)

*Fú*, here, negates not ownership but the success of an attempt to obtain ownership. This is exactly as my hypothesis would predict.

是以圣人居无为之事，行不言至教。

万物作而弗始也。

为而弗恃也。

成功而弗居也。

夫唯弗居是以弗去。

'Therefore the sage dwells in the business of non-action, he practises the teaching of non-speaking.

The myriad creatures arise, and he **refuses** to take initiatives.

He acts but **refuses** to exact gratitude for this.

He achieves results but **refuses** to dwell on them.

And precisely because he **refuses** to dwell on them, therefore he will

**refuse** to be separated from them.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 2)

不自伐故有功。

弗矜故能长。

'He does not boast about himself, therefore he has achievements.

He **refuses** to brag (about his achievements), therefore he is able to last

long.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 22)

It is hard to see how *fú* and not the verb which follows should be emphasized here. On the other hand it is easy to see why we could not have *fú* in the first sentence: *fú* tends to be anaphoric and is incompatible with the explicit *zì* 'himself'.

成功随事而弗名有也。

'(The Way) achieves its results and conducts its business, but it **refuses** to lay an explicit claim to ownership of them.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 34)

事成而身弗伐。

功立而名弗有。

'His work is accomplished but as far as his person is concerned he **refuses** to brag (about it).

His achievements are established but as far as his fame is concerned he **refuses** to claim ownership (of them).' (*Huáindanzì*, ed. Lü 19.4b).

天地大矣。

生而弗子。

成而弗有。

'Heaven and Earth are great.

They give birth [to things] but **refuse/fail to love** them.

They bring things to completion but **refuse to claim ownership** of them.

(*Lüshi chüanquä* 1.4, Chén p. 44)

君子之於物也，愛之而弗仁。  
於民也，仁之而弗亲。

As for the gentleman's relation to things, he cares for them but **refuses to treat them with benevolence**.

As for his relations to the people, he treats them with benevolence but **refuses to treat them as close relatives**. (*Mengzi* 7A45, Shén p. 948)

Here the contrastive stress, if any, is on 'treating with benevolence', 'treating as close relatives'. The emphatic hypothesis seems most uncongenial.

Jiä Yí, *Xinshü*,<sup>42</sup> has a sequence of five examples that one might usefully compare:

莫弗亲也。

'None refused to treat him as their parents.'

莫弗顺也。

'None refused to follow him.'

莫弗信也。

'None refused to trust him.'

莫弗戴也。

'None refused to support him.'

莫弗辅也。

'None refused to help him.'

However, the dating of the various parts of the *Xinshü* remains highly controversial.

*Fü wéi* means 'refuse to do or to take action'.

弗为而已则无治矣。

'If he (the sage) simply **refuses to take** (assertive) action then everything will be well-ordered.' (*Láozi* ch. 3)

Here the anaphoric object of *wéi* is far from clear although I suppose one might still insist that the verb remains 'essentially' transitive. *Fü* precedes a transitive verb certainly used in a context without a clear antecedent for an implicit anaphoric object.<sup>43</sup>

Here is another case where contrastive stress simply cannot enter the picture:

害身而利国，臣弗为也。  
害国而利臣，君不行也。

'Injuring myself and thereby profiting the state, (this) the minister **refuses to do**.

Injuring the state and thereby profiting the ministers, this the ruler **does not do**' (*Hánfēizi* 19.6.34)

Adherents of the anaphoric object hypothesis have to admit that *bü* and *fü* occupy exactly parallel syntactic positions here. Neither the fusion hypothesis nor the emphatic hypothesis can say anything helpful for this sort of parallelism.

The verbal negation hypothesis allows us to have a try: hurting himself is something the minister will **refuse to do** (although he might think of doing this). Harming the state in order to benefit a minister is something a ruler simply **does not do** (and which he would never contemplate doing in the first place). Of course, even without such an explanation (which may sound forced) the refusal hypothesis is in no serious difficulty at this point: we do say happily that 'he does not smoke and refuses to drink alcohol' without this causing us to question the distinction between 'refuse to' and 'does not' in English.

Compare:

<sup>43</sup> If is, in any case, not clear what Chinese word an understood object pronoun *zhí* would refer back to. D. C. Lau translates: "He simply takes no action and everything is in order." He interprets *zé* as if it were synonymous with *gù* 'therefore', disregards what he himself considers as an obligatory anaphoric component in *fü* and makes no attempt to understand the significance of the distinction in the text between *fü wéi* on the one hand and *wú wéi* on the other.

<sup>42</sup> Chapter Dàoshü, ed. Qi Yanzhāng (Taipei: Zhongguowénhuà zāzhishè, 1974), p. 924.



礼貌未衰，言弗行也，则去之。

'Even if the public politeness has not yet declined, if one has spoken and (the ruler) **refuses to act** (according to one's words), then one leaves him.' (*Mèngzǐ* 6B14, ed. Shén p. 863)

Here it is natural to assume an anaphoric pronoun as understood.

谓夫莫之禁而弗为者也。

'This referred to those whom no one prevents but who **refuse to act**.' (*Mèngzǐ* 7A39, Shén p. 941 reads *bù* for *fú*)

D. C. Lau, reading *fú*, none the less comes to translate: "What I said the other day referred to those who **failed to act** even when there were no obstacles" (p. 283). I sympathize with this translation, but at the same time I must point out that it is entirely inconsistent with D. C. Lau's professed stance on *fú*. Lau translates as if he held something like a refusal hypothesis.

是以圣人(弗?)行而知，不(弗?)见而名，弗为而成。

'Therefore the sage does not (**refuses to?**) travel but does get known; he does not (**refuses to?**) show himself but he does get famous; he **refuses to act** but he does get accomplished.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 47)

D. C. Lau: "Hence the sage knows without having to stir, identifies without having to see, accomplishes without having to do it." The 'it' is natural enough according to the anaphoric pronoun hypothesis, but what does it 'refer back to' in this context? Note that Lau is entitled to 'stir' for *xíng* because he adopts the *bù* of the printed versions for his text. The first ten characters of this quotation are not preserved in the Māwángdūi manuscripts and all Shima Kunio's editions have *bù* instead of *fú*. D. C. Lau copies in the text from the traditional editions without taking account of the different grammar in the Māwángdūi text.

It is hard to imagine how one plausibly could read contrastive stress into the following kind of use of *fú wéi*:

孟子曰：非礼之礼，非义之义，大人弗为。

'Mencius said: "As for an unritual ritual, or an undutiful duty, the great man will **refuse to engage** in these."' (*Mèngzǐ* 4B4, Shén p. 551)<sup>44</sup>

Zhào Qí glosses:

此皆大人所不为也。

In general Zhào Qí tends to gloss the rarer marked negative *fú* by the more common unmarked *bù*. (It is a significant argument in favour of the anaphoric interpretation of *fú* that we never seem to have the combination [*suǒ fú* + VERB] meaning anything like 'what one does not (or: refuses to) VERB' in pre-Han Chinese texts. In any case, I have yet to come across this combination. Similarly, I have yet to find [*fú zì* + VERB] 'refuse to VERB oneself'.)

我得志，弗为也。

'If I became a success, I would **refuse to do this**.' (*Mèngzǐ* 7B34, Shén p. 1014; two examples)

*Fú* in front of the co-verbal *wéi* creates a special problem:

万物归焉而弗为主。

'... the myriad creatures turn to it but (the Way) **refuses to act** as a ruler for them ...' (*Lǎozǐ* 34)

On one reading of this, *fú* provides the object of *wéi* and at the same time it negates the verbally used *zhǔ* 'act as a ruler'. We do not translate 'it is not for them that he is a ruler'.

*Hányǎnzǐ* provides an instructive parallel to this use of the co-verbal *wéi*:

今有不才之子，父母怒之弗为改，

多人讙之弗为动，  
师长教之弗为变。

'Suppose there is an untalented son. When his parents are angry with him he refuses to mend his ways on this account.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. *Huáidānzǐ* 18.16a for two further examples.

When his compatriots berate him he **refuses to do something** about it on this account.

When his teachers and superordinates instruct him, he **refuses to change on this account**' (*Hánfēizǐ* 49.7.1)

There is a fine logical point: the scope of the negation *fú* here is definitely not the transitive (co-)verb *wéi* but the verbs after this. We cannot translate 'It is not for them that he changes'. Thus, strictly speaking, the *fú* negates one verb and incorporates an anaphoric pronominal object of another (co-)verb.

For the way in which *fú* can occasionally apply to a whole verb phrase rather than a verb, compare:

於是弗果用。

'And then one **refused to actually use** (the plan):' (*Lǐjì*, Tāngōng, Couvreur I: 227; cf. also Tāngōng, Couvreur I:228)

弗果杀。

'One refused to actually kill him.' (*Lǐjì*, Tāngōng, Couvreur I:230)<sup>45</sup>

For the precise force of the idiom *fú biàn* compare the following:

故治国无法则乱。守法而弗变则悖。

'Therefore if in governing a state you have no laws there will be chaos. But if you keep to the laws and **refuse to change/adapt** them, then there will be confusion.' (*Lǐshìchūānquā* 15.8, Chén p. 935)

Here the contrastive stress, if any, or the emphasis, is on the *biàn* at least as much as on the negation. On the other hand we clearly have a case of a refusal to do what the circumstances require.

然終於此而已矣。弗与共天位也。

弗与治天职也。  
弗与食天禄也。

'However, he went no further than this. He **refused to share** with him the throne of Heaven.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. also p. 232. Huáng Jìngxīn (1958:13, exx. 72-87) provides a selection of additional examples of this kind.

He **refused to administer together** with him the heavenly offices.

He **refused to enjoy** with him the heavenly emoluments.' (*Méngzǐ* 5B3, Shén p. 694)

Note that here again *fú* negates a main verb phrase across a co-verb to which, according to the anaphoric object hypothesis it supplies the object.

Zhào Qí explains:

王公尊贤，当与共天职。

'When a king or a duke honours the talented he should share with them the heavenly offices.'

This is just the observation which motivates the use of my 'refuse to', but of course it can equally well be taken to motivate 'emphasis'. For *bú yǔ* in the same functions see examples 1-12 in Huáng Jìngxīn (1958:15).

天下弗与。

'The people of the world will **refuse to associate** with him.' (*Jīngfā* p. 18)

*Fú* can refer to the indirect object of the verb *yǔ* 'to give':

楚果弗与地……

'Chǔ actually refused to hand over the territory to them.' (*Zhànguócé*, Chǔ 1.2, ed. Zhū p. 709)<sup>46</sup>

There are many cases where contrastive stress seems thoroughly ungenial, but where at the same time the anaphoric object hypothesis finds little support:

唯弗厌是以不厌。

'Because (the sage) **refuses to oppress** them (or: **abstains** from oppressing them), therefore (the people) do not find him oppressive.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 72)

<sup>46</sup> For *fú yǔ yān* 'refuse to give it to him' see e.g. *Zhànguócé*, Zhào 1.2, ed. Zhū p. 869. There are two relevant examples on the same page.

In both cases *yàn* should probably be construed as a transitive verb with an omitted object. It is clear that contrastive stress is out of the question for this example. Indeed such stress would make the English translation sentence almost incomprehensible.

故居前而民弗害也。  
居上而民弗重也。  
天下乐推而弗厌也。

'Therefore (the sage) takes his place at the head of the people, but they **refuse to regard him as obstructive**.

He takes his place above the people, but the people **refuse to regard him as burdensome**.

The whole world supports him enthusiastically and **refuses to find him oppressive**.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 66)

In the following passage the natural contrast is between the stinging and the pouncing, so that again the contrastive stress is precisely **not** on the negative:

蜂虿虺蛇弗螫。  
攫鸟猛兽弗搏。

'(One who possesses virtue in abundance is comparable to a new born babe.) Poisonous insects and snakes (**refuse to >**) **will not** sting it.

Predatory birds and ferocious animals (**refuse to >**) **will not** pounce on it.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 55)

朴虽小而天下弗敢臣。

'Even if the uncarved block is small, the world **refuses to presume to treat it as its slave**.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 32)

Note that *jū* here does not incorporate the object of *gǎn* but the object of the complement of *gǎn*, i.e. the verbalised noun *chén*. This is a regular phenomenon with verbs like *gǎn*, 'dare to', *dé* 'manage to', and *néng* 'be able to' and is perfectly consistent with the anaphoric object hypothesis because anaphoric *zhī* may also occur in front of such verbs and be the object of their complements, especially after the negation *wéi* 'not yet, not quite'.

能辅万物之自然，而弗敢为。

'He is able to aid the natural course of things, but he **refuses to presume**<sup>47</sup> to take (assertive) action.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 64)

A. C. Graham has drawn my attention to *Lǎozǐ* 38 where *wéi zhī* is used to mean 'take assertive action' in opposition to *wú wéi*.

Contrastive stress in English yields the wrong emphasis: the stress would have to be on the verb 'take (assertive) action'.

And one does find pairs of sentences where we have apparently unmotivated free variation between the two negations:

以母则不食，以妻则食之。  
以兄之室则弗居，以於陵则居之。

'What was provided by his mother he did not eat, but what was provided by his wife he ate.

In his elder brother's house he **refused to live**, but in Wu Ling he lived.' (*Mèngzǐ* 3B10, Shén p. 469)

Of course, there is nothing more strange about this than about an English sentence like *He did not eat anything and he would not drink anything* where *did not* may be said to be used in the sense of 'would not'. But this in no way suggests that it does not make excellent sense to look for a significant difference between 'would not' and 'did not'. One can easily construct English examples where *fails to*, *abstain from* is used in apparently indiscriminate alternation with *did not*, but this should not cause the grammarian to consider these phrases as synonymous.

旷安宅而弗居，舍正路而不由，哀哉。

'To leave this peaceful dwelling empty and to **refuse to live** in it, to abandon the correct way and **not to follow** it, that is lamentable!' (*Mèngzǐ* 4A10, ed. Shén p. 507)

Already Zhào Qi conflates *jū* and *bù* in his expanded paraphrase:

<sup>47</sup> *Fú gǎn* 'refuses to take the liberty to, fail to have the courage to' comes again in *Hàn'fǎzǐ* 6.5.37 and 15.1.90 and is common elsewhere. One may say that the 'refuse to' or 'fail to' does not add anything decisive here, but it does make explicit the relevant semantic feature of *gǎn*: that it is voluntary and object-directed.

弗由居者是可哀伤哉。

'To **refuse** to follow and dwell in these things, this may be lamented.'

Note that Zhào Qí has an explicit object after the verbs which are negated by *fú*.

食而弗爱，豕交之也。  
爱而不敬，兽畜之也。

'To feed (someone) and **refuse** to love him, that is to treat him like a pig.

To love someone and not to respect him is rear him like a wild animal.'  
(*Mèngzǐ* 7A38, Shén p. 936)

Here I simply have no idea why we have *fú* in the first instance and *bù* in the second. Such free variation between semantically distinct forms is, of course, common in many languages including classical Latin and Greek. I would have expected the number of cases of this sort to have been larger than it turns out in the sample under discussion.

*Fú ài* is 'refuse to love, (contrary to expectations:) fail to love'

其子弗爱。

'... fail to love (even) one's (own) son' (*Hánfēizǐ* 10.9.62)

In case one suspects this to be a stray example, compare the following:

今弗爱其子 ...

'Now you **fail** to love (even) your (own) son...' (*Hánfēizǐ* 36.5.17)

Here contrastive stress would be on 'your own son' rather than on the negative. One might insist on 'Now you **refuse** to show love even to your own son.' But there is no need to do this, and in any case the trick unfortunately does not always work, as we shall often find in what follows.

One distinct and coherent set of examples which is difficult to reconcile with the emphatic hypothesis (but often works very well for the anaphoric object hypothesis) involves the meaning 'to fail to'. In the following we have a contrast between seeking and not getting. Contrastive stress on the negation rather than the verbs is out of the question:

馆人求之弗得。

'The men in the hostel looked for them, but **failed** to find them.'  
(*Mèngzǐ* 7B30, Shén p. 1004)

得之则生，弗得则死。

'If he gets them (a basketful of rice and a bowlful of soup) he will survive; if he **fails** to get them he will die.'  
(*Mèngzǐ* 6A10, Shén p. 784)

This is perfect for the emphatic hypothesis. Indeed, one is tempted to say that in the very frequent idioms like *fú dé* 'fail to obtain', *fú qǔ* 'fail to take (possession of)' or: fail to pick out', *fú gǎn* 'fail to have the courage to, refuse to presume', *fú néng* 'fail to be able to', *fú kě X* 'fail to be X-able', *fú rěn* 'fail to be able to bear', *fú zhì* 'fail to arrive',<sup>50</sup> the specific force of *fú* has something contrastive about it. But unfortunately I do not know how one would go about proving this.

The object of *dé* often turns out to be verbal:

桓公三往而弗得见。

'Duke Huan went to see him three times but **failed** to obtain an "audience" with him.'  
(*Hánfēizǐ* 36.11.3; cf. also 36.14.36 and 36.14.38)

Note that *fú* here supplies the anaphoric object not for the verb that follows it but for the verb *jiàn* 'have an audience with'.

视之而弗见，名之曰微。  
听之而弗闻，名之曰希。  
搏之而弗得，名之曰夷。

'What you look at but **fail** to see is called subtle.

What you listen for but **fail** to hear is called rarefied.

What you grope for but **fail** to get hold of is called intangible.'  
(*Lǎozǐ* 14)

<sup>48</sup> For the latter meaning, cf. the opening lines of *Lǚshì chūngū* 9.3.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. *Lǚjì*, Zēngzǐ wèn, ed. Couvreur I:437f.; *Shìsānjīng zhùshǔ* p. 1393 bottom, 1394 top, for two examples. See also *Chūngūjǐfánlù* ch. 1, ed. Lǎi p. 8:

弗忍书日。

'I cannot bear to record the day.'

<sup>50</sup> *Lǚjì*, Tángōng, ed. Couvreur I:127.

Here the failure to see, to hear and to get hold of is far from deliberate. The gloss 'refuse' is excluded. But so is contrastive stress on the negation: we would be inclined to stress precisely the seeing, hearing and getting hold of in English intonation. Saying that 'not seeing' is in contrast with the expected 'seeing' will make the emphatic hypothesis largely vacuous because strictly speaking every negation contrasts with a corresponding assertion, although there are some syntactic idiomatic collocations (the so-called negative polarity items) like 'not caring a fig' where one might insist that there is no positive equivalent.

The *fú* in this context is regular and seems idiomatically significant:

鬼神之为德其盛矣乎。  
视之而弗见。  
听之而弗闻。

'How rich is the power of the spirits and ghosts!

You look for them, but you **fail** to catch sight of them.

You listen out for them, but you **fail** to hear them.' (*Lǐjī*, Zhōngyōng 16, Couvreur p. 39)<sup>51</sup>

Here the contrastive stress, if any, is on the catching sight of them and on the hearing them.

Compare the current *wèi zhī wén* 'have never heard of it (mostly because there is no basis for it)' with our *fú wén* 'fail to (be able to) hear (what one is listening out for, or what one would have liked to hear)'.<sup>52</sup>

将欲取天下而为之  
吾见其弗得已。

'Whoever wishes to take the empire and govern it I consider will definitely **fail** to achieve his aim.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 29)

Note that *jù* is an intransitive verb 'last long'. The following example therefore poses a tricky problem for the anaphoric object hypothesis.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. also *Lǐjī*, Tángōng 2.2.10, Couvreur I:220. For three cases *fú jiàn* 'fail to see or find what you are looking for', see *Lǐjī*, Wènsàng, ed. Couvreur II:554.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *Zhànguócé* 3.3, ed. Zhu, p. 269 for a case of *fú wén* in which what is not heard is what someone would be interested to hear.

天地而弗能久，又况於人乎。

'If Heaven and Earth **fail** to be able to make these last long, how much less (can) men (achieve lasting results)?' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 23)

*Fú néng* '(contrary to expectations or hopes:) **fail** to be able to' comes nineteen times in *Hánfēizǐ* alone. This sort of idiomatic collocation makes it imperative to look for semantic motivation rather than for purely syntactic analysis. There is, in my view, very good reason why we do not find *fú jiǎng* 'not be about to' whereas we have *fú néng* all the time.

非其义也，非其道也，禄之以天下，弗顾也；  
系马千匹，弗视也。

'If it was not right or not according to the way, then if you enfeoffed him with the whole world he would **refuse** to take note of that.

If you gave him one thousand horses he would **refuse** to cast a glance at them.' (*Mèngzǐ* 5A7, Shén p. 653)

*Fú gù* 'refuse to take note of' is a fixed idiom.

非其食弗尝，……  
弗顾弟兄。

'He **refuses** to eat what is not his proper food, ...

He **refuses** to pay special attention to his younger and elder brothers.' (*Hànshū wǎizhuàn* 1.25, Xú p. 26)

Note incidentally the slightly complex object after *fú*. This is a Han innovation as far as I can see.

Many contexts allow for either a refusal or a failure to do something:

弗思耳矣。

'[Benevolence, dutifulness, observance of the rites, and wisdom do not give me lustre from the outside, they are in me originally.] It is just that I have **refused (failed) to** think about this, that is all.' (*Mèngzǐ* 6A6, Shén p. 757)

Here the contrastive stress in the translation, if any, is on 'think about'. The same observation applies to the following:

人人有貴於己者。弗思耳矣。

'Everyone has something which is more noble than himself. One just refuses (fails) to think about it that is all.' (*Mengzi* 6A16, Shén p. 696)

It would never occur to one to think of stress or emphasis on the negation. Again, *fú sī* works like an idiom 'fail to focus on, refuse to think about (what you are expected to focus on or think about)'.

柔之胜刚也，弱之胜强也，天下莫弗知也，而莫之能行也。

'That the pliable overcomes the rigid, that the weak overcomes the strong, this no one in the world fails to understand/recognize, but no one is able to put it into practice.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 78)

The relevant nuance is this: *fú zhī* is 'fail to understand',<sup>53</sup> whereas *bù zhī* is 'not know'. When Confucius says

我弗知也。

'This I fail to understand!' (*Lǐjì*, *Zēngzǐ wèn*, ed. Couvreur I:463)

his point is that he knows about a certain abuse, but fails to understand or condone it.<sup>54</sup>

The difference intended by *bù zhī* and *fú zhī* is something like the difference between 'does not know' and (1) 'refuse to engage in cognition', or (2) 'fail to (be able to) understand or recognise (what he ought to or would like to understand)'. Thus my theory predicts that we should have things like *fú wéi* 'refuse to engage in (assertive) action' and *fú zhī* 'refuse to engage in (assertive) cognition'.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. *Lǚshìchūnqiū* 9.4, ed. Chén p. 498; *ibidem* 15.8, ed. Chén p. 935; and *Zhāngquócè*, Qín 1.5, ed. Zhū p. 142, as well as *Zhāngquócè*, Qín 4.8, ed. Zhū p. 273; *Weiliáozi*, ed. Zhōng p. 77.

<sup>54</sup> For *fú shí* 'fail to show awareness of', see *Lǐjì*, *Tāngōng*, ed. *Shìcānjīng zhīshū* p. 1275 top. In the meaning 'be known', as in *Lúnyǔ* 1.1, the verb *zhī* can certainly not be negated by *fú* simply because in this meaning *zhī* is not a transitive verb.

泰清以之言也问乎无始曰：  
若是则无穷之弗知与无为之知  
孰是而孰非乎？

无始曰：不知深矣，知之浅矣；

弗知内矣，知之外矣。

於是泰清仰而叹曰：

弗知乃知乎？知乃不知乎？

孰知不知之知？

'Great Purity asked No Beginning about these words: "In this case which is right and which is wrong, No End's refusing to engage in cognition or No Action's knowing?"'

No Beginning said: "Not knowing is deep, knowing things is shallow. Refusing to engage in cognition is an inward matter, knowing about things is an outward matter."

Then Great Purity looked up and sighed, saying: "Is the refusal to engage in cognition knowledge, and is knowing ignorance? Who understands the knowing that does not know?"' (*Zhuāngzǐ* 22.59)

A. C. Graham (1981:163) treats *fú* as plain *bù* + *zhī*. Pulleyblank (1978:119) posits a totally arbitrary difference in emphasis. I believe that I provide a semantic account of the role of the negatives in this passage which explains why the author picked one rather than another negative in the various contexts.

Note particularly that in 'Is knowing ignorance?' *fú* would have been quite unacceptable, because then we would have to translate 'Is knowing a refusal to engage in cognition?' which is not a sensible question to ask in the context. Thus I would argue that the distribution of negatives in this instance is not as arbitrary as it may seem at first sight.

知者弗言。言者弗知。

'He who knows refuses to speak. He who speaks fails to understand.' (*Lǎozǐ* ch. 56)

知而弗言，是不谓过也。

'When one knows but refuses (fails) to speak up, that is not called "being mistaken":' (*Hànfeizi* 43.3.12; three similar examples in this context alone)

揭之免於罪。知而不揭，全伍有誅。

'If one reveals it, one will go uncharged. But if one knows it but fails to reveal it the whole group is to be executed.' (*Weiliàozi*, ed. Zhōng p. 56; there are four more exactly parallel passages on the same page)

The point here is that if one knows one may reasonably be expected to speak up or to reveal it.

I expect a failure to act in a certain way in spite of superior knowledge to be marked by *fú*:

知而弗舉，未可謂尊賢。……  
知而弗事，未可謂尊賢也。

'If one recognizes someone's worth but refuses/fails to elevate the person, then that cannot be called honouring the worthy. ...

If one recognizes his worth but refuses to serve him, then that cannot be called honouring the worthy.' (*Bóshū wúxíngpiàn*, ed. Páng p. 80)

In any case, it is interesting to see how relatively stable the *fú* is in this context:

西門豹弗知用，是其愚也。  
知而弗言，是不忠也。

'... and if Ximen Bao failed to understand how one uses (the water of the river for irrigation), then this is his stupidity.

If he did realize it but refused (failed) to speak up on the matter, then this is disloyalty.' (*Lǚshìchūnqū* 16.5, Chén p. 990)

Here *fú* supplies the object to *yòng* and has the whole verb phrase as its scope.

Evidently, even if some version of the refusal hypothesis should in the end turn out to be correct, the present suggested glosses for *fú* are evidently not a panacea for all sentences in *Lǎozǐ* in which the character occurs. I still cannot account for this sentence:

道冲而用之又弗盈也。  
(*Lǎozǐ* ch. 4)

But then I have never thought I understood this sentence in the first place.

### 3. *Fú* in the Remnants of *Qin* law

*Fú* in the Remnants of *Qin* law poses surprisingly few problems. *Fú* generally precedes transitive verbs and very clearly tends to refer to failures to do what one is supposed to do. The difficult cases will all be taken up in detail below.

As a random sample of the unproblematic typical cases I shall first present translations of some of the earliest occurrences of *fú* in the recently unearthed Remnants of *Qin* law:

自从令丞以下知而弗举论，是即明避主之明法也。

'If someone from the prefect and *cheng* rank downwards knows about this but refuses (fails) to take the matter up for judgment, then this is clear avoidance of the ruler's clear law.' (*RQL* ed. Peking 1978, p. 15)

此皆大罪也，而令丞弗明知甚不便。

'These are all serious crimes, and for the prefect or assistant to fail to clearly realize this is very inappropriate.' (*RQL* p. 16)

令丞弗得者，以令丞闻。

'If the prefect and the *cheng* fail to apprehend these, the prefect and the *cheng* are to be denounced.' (*RQL* p. 16; cf. *Weiliàozi*, ed. Zhōng p. 77)

擢行钱布者，列伍长弗告，吏循之不谨，皆有罪。

'When in case of selective circulation of cash or coins the chiefs of the groups of five of the stall keepers refuse (fail) to denounce this, and the officials are not diligent when making their rounds, all are guilty of a crime.' (*RQL* 57, A45)

逾岁而弗入及不如令者，皆以律论之。

'If more than a year has passed and the office has refused (failed) to enter (the right amount), or if the Ordinance has not been followed, in both cases this will be sentences according to the Statutes.' (*RQL* 62, A40)

Among the 79 cases of *fú* that I have managed to find in the Remnants of *Qin* law, 59 cases where such that the verb negated by *fú* does not occur in the context and where *fú* cannot be rendered by a negation with contrastive stress. In 20 of the 79 cases the negated verb does reoccur in

the context, although by no means all of these may naturally be taken to involve contrastive stress.

In 67 out of the 79 cases, *fú* designates a refusal or failure to comply with laws, statutes, regulations or general duties. Of the examples where no failure to comply with rules is implied at all, four involve the current idiom *fú néng* 'fail to be able to do (what one should be able to do)', which is close enough to the original meaning and poses no special problems.

Two tricky examples involve the idiom *fú yù*. One might try to exaggerate the contribution made by *fú* here and try to translate: 'decide that one does not wish to', as in:

此亮舜非弗欲也。不可得。

'It is not as if Yao and Shùn decided that they did not want this. It was unobtainable.' (*Sūnbīn bīngfǎ*, ed. Zhāng p. 20; cf. *Zhāngguóè*, Q1 3.7, ed. Zhū p. 575 and Zhào 5.4, ed. Zhū p. 1085)

It looks as if the ancient Chinese way of saying 'I refuse to' is to say *fú yù*. Here is a case where this does not involve an inappropriate failure to do something:

其故吏弗欲，勿强。

'If the former official **decides he does not** want this, one should not force him.' (*RQL* 40 A22)

I agree that these two examples are uncomfortable for my analysis, but they do not seem to me to be fatal.

For *fú yù* we have a rather interesting pair of examples. Consider first a standard use of *fú* in front of one of the verbs for 'to give' and then a later variant:

知伯索地於魏桓子。

魏桓子弗予。

任章曰：何故弗予？

桓子曰：无故索地，故弗予。

'The Baron of Zhi requested territory from Huánzǐ of Wèi.

Huánzǐ of Wèi **refused** to give it to him.

Rèn Zhāng asked: "Why did you **refuse** to give it to him?"

Huánzǐ replied: "He asked for territory without reason. Therefore I refused to give it to him." (*Zhāngguóè*, Wèi 1.1, ed. Zhū p. 1133)

智伯求地於魏宣子。  
宣子弗欲与之。

'Earl Zhi asked for territory from Xuānzǐ of Wèi. Xuānzǐ **decided that he did not** want to give it to him.' (*Huánzǐ*, ed. Liú 18.7a)

Yú Yuè emends this to

欲弗欲之

a less than happy suggestion. In any case *fú yù* is an idiom in Qin Chinese.

In spite of these attempts at an explanation the idiom *fú yù* remains very puzzling.

There are some more puzzling cases:

弗得居。其免也令以律居之。

'He **fails to** get to serve his fine as forced labour. If he has been dismissed, orders should be given to have him serve his fine as forced labour, in accordance with the statutes.' (*RQL* 63, A41)

This failure is according to the rules. We have noted the frequent idiom *fú dé* 'fail to achieve, fail to manage to'. Thus while special for the technical language of the legal documents, this poses no problem for my general hypothesis.

But here is a more tricky case:

其同居。典，伍当坐之。云，'反其罪'者，弗当坐。

'When (the culprit's) household members, the (village) chief and the (members of his) group of five shall be tried for his (crime) that is called "the same punishment as". When (the Statutes) say "reverse the punishment" then one should **refuse to** try them.' (*RQL* 159, D 18. For two examples *zuò zhī* 'try him' contrasting with *fú zuò* 'refuse to try, abstain from putting on trial' cf. *RQL* 96, A82.)

As the standard negation of *dāng* 'shall, should' *bù dāng* 'shall not' is ubiquitous in the Qin legal texts, as my account would predict it should be. The single exception here under discussion is special in that it involves a refusal imposed by the law. One might be tempted to explain the case by neg-raising, i.e. by saying that *fú dāng zuò* is the result of



raising the negation out of *dang fú zuò* 'one should refuse to try him'. Similar mechanisms can be seen at work in English sentences like 'I don't think she'll come' which is used to say what would more transparently be expressed by 'I think she won't come'.

The one remaining difficult *fú* for my present account is this:

何谓藏人？藏人者甲把其衣钱匿藏乙室，即告亡，  
欲令乙为盗之，而实弗盗之谓也。

'What is the meaning of "to involve others by concealing"? To involve others by concealing means A taking along his clothes and hiding these in B's house, whereupon he announces that these are lost, wishing to cause that B will be considered as having stolen them, whereas in fact he (**contrary to expectations and suspicions**) **did not** steal them, that is the meaning.' (ROL 240, D185)

There is no suggestion here of a failure to steal, even less of a refusal to steal. I can only sheepishly submit there is, at least, a failure to meet clear expectations or suspicions.

In *Zhuāngzǐ* I find a passage which is worse for my analysis:

其得罪欲君也将弗久矣。

'His falling foul of you will not take a long time.' (*Zhuāngzǐ* 24.54)

In this sort of case Ding Shēngshù as well as Pulleyblank have no explanation to offer. Neither have I. The case is very interesting because it shows what kind of evidence one would have to accumulate in order to disprove the present analysis.

#### 4. Concluding remarks

If tomorrow we find *fú yì* as a (perhaps emphatic) variant of *bù yì* meaning 'not act (or be) in accordance with one's duty' then we shall have found counterevidence to my thesis. Having written this I come across the following:

大国弗义以告弊邑。

If this meant: 'The large state did not behave in accordance with the demands of duty and informed my humble city of this', this would be

most uncomfortable for my present analysis. But the phrase means nothing of the kind. We must translate: 'Your distinguished state **refused** to regard this as being in accordance with duty and informed my unworthy city of this.' (*Zhànguócé* 88, Qín 2.15, ed. Zhū p. 253, cf. J.1. Crump p. 92)

Gāo Yòu glosses this passage as I predict and, I hasten to add, as Ding Shēngshù would have predicted on the basis of his fusion theory:

弗义不以为义也。

"*fú yì* means 'does not consider it as in accordance with duty'."

The textual history here is fascinating. We are told that "one edition has *fú* for *bù*" (ibidem). We know that Gāo Yòu's text must have read *fú yì* because he happens to have found the phrase difficult and because he has given us a gloss for it. *Fú yì* being the lectio difficilior, Zhū Zǔgēng is surely right when he reads the text as I have reproduced it here.

According to our account,

丑父弗忠也。

cannot mean 'Chǒu Fǔ was not a loyal man' but comes to mean 'refused to treat him as loyal' (*Chūnqíjǔfānlù* ch. 3, ed. Lǐ p. 46).

Huáng Jǐngxīn (1958, no. 60) provides the following example for a use of *fú* in front of an intransitive verb:

日起请夫环。执政弗义弗敢复也。

'On another day I asked for the ring, but you, Minister of State, **refused** to consider this as proper, and I **refused** to presume to repeat my request.' (*Zuózhuan*, Duke Zhao 16, fū 3, ed. *Shìsānjīng zhùshū* p. 2079, bottom)

Huáng construes the *zhí zhèng fú yì* as 'you, Minister of State, were unrighteous', but Yang Bójūn (1981:1379) glosses correctly:

弗义，不以为义也。

This is as Ding Shēngshù would predict. It does not decide between his interpretation and mine.

If I saw the graphs

弗好

I would, together with Ding Shengshù, read *fú hào* but tend to translate not just 'not (happen) to like (it)' but 'refuse to like'.<sup>55</sup> *Fú yuè* would have to be 'decided he did not like' as in

孟尝君有舍人而弗悦。欲逐之。

'The Lord of Mèngcháng had a retainer and **decided that he did not like** him. He wanted to expel the man.' (*Zhànguócé*, Qí 3.8, ed. Zhū p. 577)

The story ends well in every way. Having been told that he *yù zhú zhī* 'wanted to expel him' we now hear:

乃弗逐。

'He **decided he would not** expel the man.' (*Ibidem*)

The pattern where someone wants to do X to someone but decides not to do it to him (*fú X*) is common:

楚怒。将罪之。...

楚王曰：善。乃弗罪。

'(The King of) Chǔ grew angry and was about to take legal action against the man. ...

The King of Chǔ said: "All right." And he **abstained from** taking legal action against him.' (*Zhànguócé*, e.g. in Hǎn 2.10, ed. Zhū p. 1432)

I expect a current expression like *fú gù* 'refuse to pay any attention to, refuse to even look at' (passim), *fú chū* 'refuse to let out',<sup>56</sup> *fú rǔ* 'refuse to let in',<sup>57</sup> *fú sǐ* 'refuse to die for him',<sup>58</sup> *fú tú* 'refuse to take

<sup>55</sup> Cf. *Zhuāngzǐ* 6.19 which is unfortunately opaque in the relevant respect.

<sup>56</sup> *Zhànguócé*, Chǔ 2.8, ed. Zhū, p. 791.

<sup>57</sup> *Zhànguócé*, Hǎn 3.11, ed. Zhū p. 1480.

<sup>58</sup> *Sūnbīn bīngfǎ*, ed. Zhāng, p. 174.

this into account', *fú xiè ér qù* 'refuse to say farewell to someone and leave',<sup>60</sup> *wǎng zhě fú sòng* means 'refuse to send off those who go away'.<sup>61</sup> Note incidentally, that *bù zhī sòng* in this context would be unacceptable. *Fú jiù* is current for 'refuse to rescue',<sup>62</sup> but an expression like *fú kǒng* 'not get scared' (and indeed a causative usage of *kǒng* to mean 'cause to be scared') would be curious and would need a very special context in order not to count as counterevidence. *Fú nù*, if indeed it ever occurs, and if my hypothesis turns out right, has to mean 'refuse to get angry (at someone or something)' and not '(happen to) not get angry at him'. *Fú míng* meaning 'not be called [so-and-so]' would be a counterexample to my hypothesis, whereas *fú wéi* 'refuse to act as, refuse to do it' should be current.<sup>63</sup> *Fú rù* 'refuse to enter' would not create a problem, neither should *jù ér fú nà* 'keep at a distance and refuse to let in'<sup>64</sup> but *fú zài* 'not be inside' would be *prima facie* counterevidence against my hypothesis.

If *fú rán* ever meant 'happen not to consider to be the case' then that would be neat counterevidence to my claim. If I saw the construction I would be inclined to interpret it as 'refuse to consider (it) as so/right' and not just as '(happen) not (to) think of it as being so'. *Fú yuè* would have to mean 'refuse to be amused' and it will presuppose that someone has been trying to amuse. The phrase should never simply mean 'happen to be displeased'.<sup>65</sup> Similarly for *fú shù* 'refuse to (not) happen to)

<sup>59</sup> *Zhànguócé*, Zhào 1.3, ed. Zhū p. 881.

<sup>60</sup> *Zhànguócé*, Qí 6.6, ed. Zhū p. 690.

<sup>61</sup> *Sūnbīn bīngfǎ*, ed. Zhāng p. 130.

<sup>62</sup> *Zhànguócé*, Qí 1.6, ed. Zhū p. 487; *Zhànguócé*, Yǎn 1.3, ed. Zhū p. 1513; *Sūnbīn bīngfǎ* ed. Zhāng p. 95; *Jīngfǎ* p. 60.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. *Zhànguócé*, Hǎn 3.5, ed. Zhū p. 1468; *Zhànguócé*, Yǎn 2.11, ed. Zhū p. 1629.

<sup>64</sup> *Chūnqiūfǎnlù* ch. 4, ed. Lǎi p. 65.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. the famous story of the man who is fond of swearing and of using extravagant language in *Lǚshì chūnqiū* 9.3, where his audience, the *mén rén*, are said to *fú yuè*: 'refuse to be amused [by his verbal efforts]'. I used to think of this

consider as right or correct'. In any case I refuse to consider as correct any hypothesis on *fú* which does not run a very well-defined risk of being proved wrong by future evidence.

## References

- Boodberg, P. A. 1937. Some proleptical remarks on the evolution of Archaic Chinese. *HJAS* 2:329-372.
- Chūcí* 楚辞. Ed. Shibūbeiyào 四部备要 Shanghai: Commercial Press.
- Couvreux, S. 1913. *Li Ki*. 2 vols. Ho Kien Fou: Imprimerie de la Mission Catholique. (礼记)
- Crump, J. I. 1970. *Chan-Kuo Ts'è*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dǐng Shēngshù. 1935. 丁声树 释否定词‘弗’，‘不’，在庆祝蔡元培先生六十五岁论文集 vol. 2, p. 967-997.
- Dobson, W. A. C. H. 1959. *Late Archaic Chinese*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Dobson, W. A. C. H. 1974. *A Dictionary of the Chinese Particles*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Féng Zuómín. 1983. 冯作民 白话战国策, 3 vols., Taipei: Xingguangchubanshe.
- Gāo Héng. 1974. 高亨 商君书注释. Peking: Zhōnghuáshūjū.
- Graham, A. C. 1952. A probable fusion word: 勿 wū = 毋 wú/之 jǐ. *BSOAS* 14: 134-148.
- Graham, A. C. 1978. *Later Mohist Logic, Ethics and Science*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press and London: London School of Oriental Studies.
- Graham, A. C. 1981. *Chuang Tzu, The Inner Chapters*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Graham, A. C. 1983. Yún 云 and yuē 曰 as verbs and particles. *Acta Orientalia Havniensia* 44: 33-71.
- Boodberg, P. A. 1937. Some proleptical remarks on the evolution of Archaic Chinese. *HJAS* 2:329-372.
- Chūcí* 楚辞. Ed. Shibūbeiyào 四部备要 Shanghai: Commercial Press.
- Couvreux, S. 1913. *Li Ki*. 2 vols. Ho Kien Fou: Imprimerie de la Mission Catholique. (礼记)
- Crump, J. I. 1970. *Chan-Kuo Ts'è*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dǐng Shēngshù. 1935. 丁声树 释否定词‘弗’，‘不’，在庆祝蔡元培先生六十五岁论文集 vol. 2, p. 967-997.
- Dobson, W. A. C. H. 1959. *Late Archaic Chinese*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Dobson, W. A. C. H. 1974. *A Dictionary of the Chinese Particles*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Féng Zuómín. 1983. 冯作民 白话战国策, 3 vols., Taipei: Xingguangchubanshe.
- Gāo Héng. 1974. 高亨 商君书注释. Peking: Zhōnghuáshūjū.
- Graham, A. C. 1952. A probable fusion word: 勿 wū = 毋 wú/之 jǐ. *BSOAS* 14: 134-148.
- Graham, A. C. 1978. *Later Mohist Logic, Ethics and Science*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press and London: London School of Oriental Studies.
- Graham, A. C. 1981. *Chuang Tzu, The Inner Chapters*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Graham, A. C. 1983. Yún 云 and yuē 曰 as verbs and particles. *Acta Orientalia Havniensia* 44: 33-71.
- Hánfēizǐ 韩非子 韩非子索引 ed. Hánfēizǐ suǒyǐn Peking: Zhōnghuáshūjū, 1982.
- Hawkes, David. 1959. *Ch'u Tzu. Songs of the South*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Huáng Jīnhóng. 1977. 黄锦 释庄子中的不与弗. In: 庄子及其文学, p. 111-146. Taipei: Dongdatshu.
- Huáng Jīngxīn. 1958. 黄景欣 秦汉以前古汉语中的否定词‘弗’，‘不’研究. 语言研究. 3:1-24.
- Hulsewé, A. F. P. 1985. *Remnants of Ch'in Law. An annotated translation of the Ch'in legal and administrative rules of the 3rd century B.C. discovered in Yun-meng Prefecture, Hu-pei Province, in 1975*. Leiden: E. J. Brill. [Quoted as ROL by entry number.]
- Jīngfǎ 1976 经法 马王堆汉墓帛书经法. 马王堆汉墓帛书整理小组编. Peking: Wénwùchūbǎnshè.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1957. *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.
- Lài Yányuán. 1987. 赖炎元 春秋繁露今注今译. Taipei: Commercial Press.
- Lǚ Shùxiāng. 1955. 吕叔湘 论‘毋’与‘勿’. *Studia Serica* 4, reprinted in his 汉语语法论文集. Peking: Kēxuéchūbǎnshè.
- Mèngzǐ 孟子 ed. Harvard Yenching Sinological Index Series. Miào Wényuán. 1983. 缪文远 战国策新校注. Chengdu: Bāshūshūshè.
- Mòzǐ 墨子 ed. Harvard Yenching Sinological Index Series. Páng Pǔ. 1988. 庞朴 帛书五行篇研究. Jinan: Qūchūbǎnshè. [Quoted as *Bóshū wǔxíngpiān*] Pulleyblank, E. G. 1978. Emphatic negatives in classical Chinese. In David T. Roy and Tsuen-hsün Tsién (eds.), *Ancient China: Studies in Early Civilisation*, p. 115-135. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

- Serruys, Paul L.-M. 1969. Negatives in the Language of the Inscriptions of Shang. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Oriental Society, New York, March 15 (Not seen).
- Shuǐhǔdì Qīn mù zhūjiàn*. 1978. 睡虎地秦墓竹简  
Peking: Wénwùchūbǎnshè. [quoted as ROL]
- Sīmǎ Qiān. 1956. (司马迁)  
史记会注考证.  
ed. Takigawa Kametarō 泷川龟太郎  
reprint Peking: Zhōnghuáshūjū.  
*Shǐjì suǒyǐn* 1989. 史记索引  
Peking: Television Publishing Co.
- Sūn Bīn bīngfǎ* 1976  
孙臧兵法校理  
Peking: Zhōnghuáshūjū.
- Sūn zǐ bīngfǎ* 1976.  
孙子兵法 (银雀山汉墓竹简)  
Peking: Wénwùchūbǎnshè.
- Takashima, K. 1973. *Negatives in the King Wu Ting Bone Inscriptions*.  
PhD dissertation, Seattle: University of Washington.
- Takashima, K. 1988. Morphology of the negatives in oracle-bone inscriptions. *Computer Analysis of Asian and African Languages* 80:113-133.
- Xīnshū*  
贾谊, 新书 (ed. 祁玉章).  
*Xúnzǐ* 荀子  
ed. Harvard Yenching Sinological Index Series.
- Yang Bójiàn. 1981. 杨伯峻  
春秋左传注  
Peking: Zhōnghuáshūjū.
- Zhōng Zhāohuá. 1982. 钟兆华  
尉缭子校注  
Henan: Zhōngzhōushūhuàshè. [This edition takes account of the recently discovered bamboo slip version of the text.]
- Zhū Qíxiáng 1990. 朱歧祥  
殷墟卜辞句法论稿  
Taibei: Student Book Company.
- Zhuāngzǐ* 庄子  
ed. Harvard Yenching Sinological Index Series.
- Zuǒzhuàn* 左传  
ed. Harvard Yenching Sinological Index Series.

Appendix: Character glossary  
(expressions not found in this list, may be found in the references section; the number between brackets refers to the page of first occurrence)

变	biàn (34)
不	bù (2)
不当	bù dāng (47)
不悔	bù huǐ (17)
不惑	bù huò (16)
不见	bù jiàn (24)
不见而明	bù jiàn ér míng (25)
不敬	bù jìng (6)
不惧	bù jù (21)
不肯受	bù kěn shòu (25)
不伤类人	bù shāng lèi (17)
不失	bù shī (15)
不为	bù wéi (23)
不为 X 用	bù wéi X yòng (21)
不我	bù wǒ (2)
不义	bù yì (48)
不迂	bù yū (19)
不与	bù yǔ (35)
不欲为	bù yù (23)
不振	bù zhèn (23)
不知	bù zhī (5)
不知之送	bù zhī sòng (51)
不臣	chén (36)
当	dāng (47)
得当	dāng fù zuò (48)
得当	dé (36)
得逢	fēng shì (8)
弗	fú (1)
弗	fú ài (38)
弗	fú biàn (34)
弗	fú, bù kěn yě (25)
弗出	fú chū (50)

坐 弗当得阿逢世  
 逢 弗阿逢世  
 感 弗感  
 取 弗取  
 顾 弗顾  
 怪 弗怪  
 责 弗责  
 活 弗活  
 惑 弗惑  
 及 弗及  
 见 弗见  
 将 弗将  
 敬 弗敬  
 救 弗救  
 恨 弗恨  
 可 弗可  
 恐 弗恐  
 类 弗类  
 迷 弗迷  
 名 弗名  
 能 弗能  
 怒 弗怒  
 取 弗取  
 然 弗然  
 忍 弗忍  
 如 弗如  
 入 弗入  
 若 弗若  
 丧 弗丧  
 失 弗失  
 识 弗识  
 视 弗视  
 是 弗是  
 受 弗受  
 思 弗思  
 死 弗死  
 似 弗似

## X

fú dāng zuò (47)  
 fú dé (1)  
 fú ē (15)  
 fú féng (20)  
 fú féng shì (20)  
 fú gǎn (19)  
 fú gǎn (37, fn.47)  
 fú gù (41)  
 fú guài (19)  
 fú guì (14)  
 fú huó (19)  
 fú huò (16)  
 fú jí (15)  
 fú jiàn (2)  
 fú jiāng (41)  
 fú jìng (6)  
 fú jìn (51)  
 fú jù (20)  
 fú kě X (39)  
 fú kǒng (51)  
 fú lèi (17)  
 fú mí (16, fn.20)  
 fú míng (51)  
 fú néng (39)  
 fú nù (21)  
 fú qǔ (39)  
 fú rán (51)  
 fú rěn (39)  
 fú rú (18)  
 fú rù (50)  
 fú ruò (18)  
 fú sàng (19)  
 fú shī (15)  
 fú shí (42, fn. 54)  
 fú shì (24)  
 fú shì (51)  
 fú shòu (15)  
 fú sī (42)  
 fú sī (50)  
 fú sì (18)

听 弗图忘为畏闻我恶谢羞嗅疑义应有迂焉  
 悦 弗悦  
 在 弗在  
 振 弗振  
 知 弗知  
 之 弗之  
 至 弗至  
 逐 弗逐  
 自 弗自  
 坐 弗坐  
 敢 弗敢  
 感 弗感  
 高 弗高  
 故 弗故  
 怪 弗怪  
 管 弗管  
 韩 弗韩  
 汉 弗汉  
 昭 弗昭  
 书 弗书  
 帝 弗帝  
 休 弗休  
 南 弗南  
 见 弗见

## V

fú tīng (2)  
 fú tú (50)  
 fú wàng (9, fn.7)  
 fú wéi (30)  
 fú wèi (20)  
 fú wén (40)  
 fú wǒ (2)  
 fú wù (20)  
 fú xiè ér qù (51)  
 fú xiū (21)  
 fú xiù (21)  
 fú yí (10)  
 fú yí (48)  
 fú yīng (19)  
 fú yǒu (28)  
 fú yǔ (20)  
 fú yǔ yān (35, fn.46)  
 fú yù (46)  
 fú yuè (50)  
 fú zài (51)  
 fú zhèn (2)  
 fú zhī (16)  
 fú zhī tīng (10)  
 fú zhì (39)  
 fú zhú zhī (21)  
 fú zì + V (33)  
 fú zuò (47)  
 gǎn (3)  
 gǎn (19)  
 Gāo Yòu (24)  
 gù (31, fn. 43)  
 guài zhī (19)  
 Guānzī (3)  
 Hanshūwàizhuàn (15)  
 Hànsū (14, fn. 12)  
 Hàn Zhāodì (4)  
 Hé Xiū (12)  
 Huánānzī (3)  
 jiàn (39)



Ges 11

PL 1022

F 338

1022



32101 038345938

# CONTENTS

List of Contributors	vii
Preface	ix
CHRISTOPH HARBSMEIER	
<i>Fù</i> in the Mawangdui manuscripts of the <i>Laozi</i> and in the	
<i>Remnants of Qin law</i>	1
HENRIËTTE HENDRIKS	
Where do events take place: setting the spatial frame in	
Chinese children's narratives	61
JIANG SHAOYU	
Colloquial words in Hui Lin's <i>Yiqiejing yinyi</i>	85
LI PING	
The acquisition of the <i>zai</i> and <i>ba</i> constructions in	
Mandarin Chinese	103
J. C. P. LIANG	
Cultural transposition in translation	121
PETER PEVERELLI	
The category of adjective in Chinese grammars	129
SHEN JIAXUAN	
A meta-linguistic adverb <i>hao</i> in Mandarin Chinese	141
RINT SYBESMA	
Duration, frequency and the Postverbal Constraint	153
JEROEN WIEDENHOF	
'Three inches high' in Mandarin	183

J. C. P. Liang and R. P. E. Sybesma (Eds.)  
 From Classical *Fù* to 'Three Inches High'  
 Studies on Chinese in Honor of Erik Zürcher  
 Leuven/Apeldoorn

Garant  
 1993 - First edition  
 X + 194 p. - 24 cm  
 D/1993/5779/53  
 ISBN 90-5350-249-1  
 NUGI 941

Cover: Bert Brys  
 © The authors and Garant Publishers

All Rights reserved.  
 No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
 stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means,  
 electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise  
 without the prior permission of the copyright owners.

Garant  
 Tienessesteenweg 83, 3010 Leuven - Kessel-Lo (Belgium)  
 Konijnmeilaan 96, 7315 EB Apeldoorn (The Netherlands)