Chapter 4  Passives

In Mandarin, passive sentences typically take either of the two forms illustrated in (1) and (2):

(1)  Zhangsan bei Lisi da le.
    Zhangsan BEI Lisi hit LE
    ‘Zhangsan was hit by Lisi.’

(2)  Zhangsan bei da le.
    Zhangsan BEI hit LE
    ‘Zhangsan was hit.’

Both forms involve the passive morpheme bei. In (1) bei is followed by an NP (the agent) and a VP. In (2) bei is followed directly by the VP. In the latter case, the existence of an agent is not expressed, but implied. We shall refer to these two forms of the passive construction as the ‘long passive’ and the ‘short passive’, respectively.¹

¹ There is another type of sentence with the semantics of a passive, where both the agent argument and the passive morpheme bei are missing:

(i)  yifu xi-ganjing le.
    clothes wash-clean LE
    ‘The clothes have been washed clean.’

We take this type of passive to be an example of the middle construction, akin to English sentences like *The
A natural question arises as to whether these forms are to be derivationally related, and if so, how. For example, it may be natural to regard the short passive as being derived from the long passive by omission of the agent phrase. This chapter will argue that this analysis, however intuitive it may be, is false. In Sections 2-3, we shall discuss the long and short passives in turn and argue that they involve somewhat different processes in derivation. In Section 4, we turn our attention to two types of ‘indirect’ passives and argue that they should be analyzed on a par with ‘direct passives,’ in terms of the analyses proposed in Sections 2-3.

In what follows, ‘passive’ will be used to refer to the long passive mostly, unless reference to the short passive is clear from context. This is because the long passive is the most robust form of the passive construction, exhibiting properties with which the bulk of this chapter will be concerned.

4.1. The Mandarin Long Passive

4.1.1. Two Competing Traditions

From the early days of generative linguistics, two competing lines of research have existed in the analysis of Chinese passives. One line of research assumes that they are derived as an instance of NP movement as typical English passives are derived, according to which an underlying object moves to a surface subject position in the presence of the morpheme bei.

The other line denies the existence of such movement, but postulates a structure of VP

book sold well. See Cheng and Huang (1994) for an analysis of (i) as a middle construction and arguments in its support.
complementation according to which *bei* is a matrix verb taking an embedded clause whose object is deleted under identity with the matrix subject. These two approaches have existed side by side for nearly 30 years, with P. Wang (1970) being an early proponent of the movement approach and Hashimoto (1969) being the most prominent early advocate of the complementation approach. More recent adherents of the movement approach include A. Li (1985, 1990), Travis (1984), and Koopman (1984). The complementation approach has also been defended at length in more recent works such as Hashimoto (1987) and Wei (1994).

According to recent versions of the movement hypothesis, the passive morpheme *bei* has the property of *suppressing* (or *dethematizing*) the subject argument of the main verb, and *absorbing* its Accusative Case feature, which would normally be assigned to its Theme object. The Case-less Theme object then undergoes movement to the non-thematic subject position. The Agent argument is realized as part of an adjunct PP headed by the passive morpheme *bei*, assumed to be a P.

(3) Passive as NP-Movement
   a. Subject argument is suppressed.
   b. Accusative Case is absorbed.
   c. Theme object undergoes NP-movement to subject position
   d. *bei* and the Agent NP form a PP adjunct

Thus an active sentence like *Lisi da-le Zhangsan* ‘Lisi hit Zhangsan’ is turned into a passive with the structure shown in (4):

(4) IP
Because passives are derived by NP-movement, it is correctly predicted that the theme
subject is necessarily related to an empty category -- an NP trace co-indexed with it -- in the
object position. The ungrammaticality of the following sentences is therefore explained in
Chinese, as it is in English.²

(5) a. *Zhangsan bei Lisi da-le ta.
    Zhangsan BEI Lisi hit-LE him
    ‘Zhangsan was hit (*him) by Lisi.’

   b. *Zhangsan bei Lisi da-le ziji.
      Zhangsan BEI Lisi hit-LE self
      ‘Zhangsan was hit (*self) by Lisi.’

   c. *Zhangsan bei Lisi da-le Wangwu.
      Zhangsan BEI Lisi hit-LE Wangwu
      ‘Zhangsan was hit (*Wangwu) by Lisi.’

² The status of (5a-b) in relation to the analysis of passives was discussed in Huang (1982b) and A. Li (1990).
As will be seen below, sentences of the sort represented by (5c-d) may be acceptable in some languages, each
with a strong sense of ‘adversity’, e.g., Zhangsan was adversely affected by Lisi’s hitting Wangwu or by Lisi’s
arrival. Some speakers of Mandarin find (5c-d) marginally acceptable under the adversative reading.
d. *Zhangsan bei Lisi lai-le. (no object at all)

   Zhangsan BEI Lisi come -LE

   ‘*Zhangsan was arrived by Lisi.’

The NP movement hypothesis entails the existence of an NP trace in the object position, from which the subject originated. (5d) is ungrammatical because it does not have an object position, and (5a-c) because the object position is filled by a distinct NP, and so the subject could not have originated there.

There are several difficulties with this NP movement approach, however. First, this approach claims that the subject position of passives is a non-thematic position, but the following sentences suggest that the subject does not always play a pure Patient or Theme role which it inherits from the NP-trace; it may receive a thematic role of its own. This is evidenced by passive sentences containing subject-oriented adverbs like guyi ‘deliberately, intentionally’:  

(6) Zhangsan guyi bei da-le.

   Zhangsan intentionally BEI hit -LE

   ‘Zhangsan intentionally got hit.’

(7) Zhangsan guyi bei Lisi da-le.

---

3 These sentences would be most natural if guyi is put in focus, e.g., as part of a cleft sentence:

(i) Zhangsan shi guyi bei (Lisi) da-le.

   Zhangsan be intentionally BEI (Lisi) hit -LE

   ‘Zhangsan intentionally got hit (by Lisi).’
Zhangsan intentionally got hit by Lisi.

Subject-oriented adverbs impose selectional restrictions and are predicated on their subjects but not their objects. So for *guyi* only an NP denoting an Agent or Experiencer can qualify as its subject. This means that the subject of (6)-(7) cannot simply bear whatever theta-role it would bear in the object position following *da* ‘hit’, i.e., Theme or Patient, but must be an Agent or Experiencer also. Under the NP-movement analysis, the subject would acquire its theta-role solely by inheriting it from the object, but being a Theme or Patient does not meet the selectional requirements of *guyi*. In other words, the occurrence of subject-oriented adverbs suggests that the subject of *bei* sentences may be base-generated and receive its theta role in situ, instead of acquiring its subject status and theta role through movement. In this respect, Chinese passives behave on a par with *get* passives in English, but differently from *be* passives (Lasnik and Fiengo 1974, 552f), a difference that does not follow if both passive constructions are treated in the same way under NP-movement.

(8)  a. *The pedestrian was hit deliberately.*
     b. The pedestrian got hit deliberately.

(9)  a. *Rodman intentionally was fouled by Ewing.*
     b. Rodman intentionally got fouled by Ewing.

Secondly, since the *bei*-NP sequence is treated as a prepositional phrase (on a par with a *by*-phrase), it is expected to behave as a PP. But there is never any evidence that it behaves as a PP, or even as a constituent. For one thing, it cannot move (as a constituent)
across a time phrase or prepose to a sentence-initial position (unlike the PP by Bill in the English translation):

(10) a. Zhangsan zuotian bei Lisi da-le.
      Zhangsan yesterday BEI Lisi hit-LE
      (cf. John was hit by Bill yesterday.)

b. *Zhangsan bei Lisi zuotian da-le.
      Zhangsan BEI Lisi yesterday hit-LE
      (cf. John was hit yesterday by Bill.)

c. *bei Lisi Zhangsan zuotian da-le.
      BEI Lisi Zhangsan yesterday hit-LE
      (cf. It was by Bill that John was hit yesterday.)

Other putative PPs are normally movable (see Chapter 1, ex. 42):

(11) a. wo gen Zhangsan hen chu-de-lai.
      I with Zhangsan very get-along
      ‘I get along well with Zhangsan.’

b. gen Zhangsan wo hen chu-de-lai.
   with Zhangsan I very get-along
   ‘I get along well with Zhangsan.’

(12) a. Zhangsan dui Lisi hen keqi.
      Zhangsan to Lisi very polite
      ‘Zhangsan is very polite to Lisi.’
b.  
\[ dui \ Lisi \ Zhangsan \ hen \ keqi. \]

to Lisi Zhangsan very polite

‘Zhangsan is very polite to Lisi.’

(13)  
a.  
\[ wo \ bai-le \ yi-pen \ hua \ zai \ zhuozi-shang. \]

I put one-pot flower on table-top

‘I put a pot of flowers on the table.’

b.  
\[ wo \ zai \ zhuozi-shang \ bai-le \ yi-pen \ hua. \]

I on table-top put one-pot flower

‘I put a pot of flowers on the table.’

c.  
\[ zai \ zhuozi-shang \ wo \ bai-le \ yi-pen \ hua. \]

on table-top I put one-pot flower

‘I put a pot of flowers on the table.’

Thirdly, the following coordination test shows that the Agent NP forms a clausal constituent with the VP that follows it, to the exclusion of the preceding bei.\(^4\)

---

\(^4\) Coordination is also possible with bei repeated in the second conjunct. But this fact is irrelevant to the point being made. Sentences like the following are generally considered to be cases of right-node raising (RNR). RNR is often used to identify the constituency of the raised phrase, but not that of the remnant. In (i), RNR establishes that kanjian le is a (VP) constituent.

(i)  
\[ ta \ you \ bei \ Zhangsan, \ you \ bei \ Lisi, \ kanjian \ le. \]

he also BEI Zhangsan also BEI Lisi, see LE

‘He was seen both by Zhangsan and by Lisi.’
This shows that \textit{bei+NP} does not form a constituent that excludes the following VP, and is hence not a PP.

A fourth argument against the PP analysis of the \textit{bei}-NP comes from anaphor-binding (see Chapter 9 for details), in particular the referential interpretation of a reflexive pronoun like \textit{ziji} `self`. It is now widely known that the reflexive \textit{ziji} is `subject-oriented’, i.e., it must take a subject as its antecedent (see Tang 1989; Cole, Hermon, and Sung 1990; Huang and Tang 1991; Y. Li 1993 inter alia). This is illustrated by (15) below, where \textit{ziji} must have \textit{Zhangsan} but not \textit{Lisi} as its antecedent:

\begin{enumerate}
\item Zhan\textsuperscript{a}. \textit{Zhangsan gen Lisi taolun-le ziji de xiangfa.}
\vspace{1em}
\textit{Zhangsan with Lisi discuss-le self DE opinion}
\vspace{1em}
\`Zhangsan, discussed with Lisi\textsubscript{j} his\textsubscript{i/*j} opinion.’
\item Zhan\textsuperscript{b}. \textit{Zhangsan tongzhi-le Lisi ziji de fenshu.}
\vspace{1em}
\textit{Zhangsan informed-le Lisi self DE grade}
\vspace{1em}
\`Zhangsan\textsubscript{i} informed Lisi\textsubscript{j} of his\textsubscript{i/*j} grade.’
\end{enumerate}

In the following passive sentences, however, \textit{ziji} can refer to \textit{Zhangsan} or to \textit{Lisi}, suggesting that they are both subjects. In particular, the agent NP \textit{Lisi} is not a prepositional object, but a subject of an embedded clause:\footnote{See Xu (1993) and Cole and Wang (1996) for additional examples. For many speakers there is a strong}

\begin{enumerate}
\item (14) (?)\textit{ta bei Lisi ma-le liang-sheng, Wangwu ti-le san-xia.}
\end{enumerate}

\textit{he \textit{BEI} Lisi scold-LE twice \textit{Wangwu kick-LE three-times}}

\`He was scolded twice by Lisi and kicked three times by Wangwu.’
Zhangsan bei Lisi guan zai ziji de jiali.

Zhangsan BEI Lisi lock at self DE home

‘Zhangsan was locked by Lisi in self’s home. (ZS or LS’s)’

nei-feng xin bei Lisi dai-hui ziji de jia qu-le.

that-Cl letter BEI Lisi bring-back self DE home go-LE

‘That letter was brought back to self’s (Lisi's) home by Lisi.’

Thus considerations of thematic relations, constituency, and anaphora jointly call into question an NP-movement analysis of passives.⁶

These considerations favor a complementation analysis, according to which bei is treated as the main verb, a two-place predicate meaning ‘undergo’, ‘experience’, etc., which selects an Experiencer as its subject and an Event as its complement. The object of the Event complement clause is obligatorily deleted under identity with the matrix subject. Recent proponents of this approach include Hashimoto (1987) and references cited there, and Wei

⁶ There is also a difficulty with treating bei as a P which arises from the way the subject argument is suppressed and the object Case is absorbed. It is assumed (e.g., Travis 1984) that both argument suppression and Case absorption are triggered by bei. But general considerations do not allow the head of an adjunct PP to affect the argument structure or Case property of a main verb.
(1994). Under the complementation analysis, a long passive like (1) has the following structure:

(18)

This approach is particularly attractive when we consider the four problems just noted for the movement approach. First, because *bei* is a two-place predicate with its own subject argument, a subject-oriented adverb may be naturally accommodated. If a passive sentence

---

7 The complementation approach goes back to Hashimoto (1969). The third argument above, concerning the clausal constituency of NP-VP following *bei*, was presented by Wei (1994) to show that *bei* was clearly a verb taking a clausal complement in historical Chinese. The above point here establishes that the same constituency status of NP-VP remains for modern Chinese. Since Wei was dealing with a historical stage where the Theme subject could still be related to an overt pronoun in postverbal position (unlike in Modern Chinese, as shown in (5a-c)), Wei's argument really only established the complementation structure of the historical stage that concerned him.
expresses an undergoing by an Experiencer, then it is entirely normal that an Experiencer may intentionally undergo some event. Secondly, as indicated by the tree diagram above, *bei* and the Agent NP do not form a constituent, let alone a PP constituent. Hence the *bei* + NP sequence does not behave as a PP, as shown above. Thirdly, in (18) the Agent forms an IP with the VP that follows it, predicting the coordination fact indicated above. Finally, the problem of reflexive binding is also explained. According to (18), both the Experiencer *Zhangsan* and the Agent *Lisi* are subjects (matrix and embedded subjects, respectively), so in (16) and (17) the reflexive may be bound by *Lisi* and, in (15), by either *Lisi* or *Zhangsan*. Every problem that arose under the NP-movement approach disappears under the complementation approach.

A problem arises, however, concerning the obligatoriness of deleting the embedded object. As indicated in (18), the embedded null object would be an empty pronoun (a pro in the sense of Chomsky 1981). Whether a true pro is possible in object position is still controversial at best (see Huang 1984a, 1989 and references cited). Even if it is possible, the question remains why it cannot be replaced by an overt pronoun or reflexive. As we know, an embedded object can normally take the form of an overt pronoun or anaphor:

    Zhangsan say Lisi hit-le him
    ‘Zhangsan said Lisi hit him.’

b. Zhangsan shuo Lisi da-le ziji.
    Zhangsan say Lisi hit-le self
    ‘Zhangsan said Lisi hit self.’
Except for the choice of their main verbs, these sentences have the same structures as the passive structure in (18). The question that the complementation theory raises is why a change from the verb *shuo* ‘say’ to the verb *bei* ‘undergo’ makes complement object deletion obligatory, and this seems a difficult question to answer. The question does not arise, of course, under the NP-movement approach, according to which the empty postverbal element is an NP-trace, an empty category which cannot be replaced by lexical material.

We have thus come to a situation where both the movement approach and the complementation approach seem to be correct and incorrect at the same time. In fact these two approaches seem to complement each other, so the problems that arise under one approach seem to provide evidence for the other, and vice versa.

### 4.1.2. The Analysis: A’-movement and Predication

The situation just described has persisted since the earliest generative studies of Chinese syntax, with scholars adhering to their favorite analyses but unaware of, or ignoring, problems associated with them. An analysis that came close to a solution to the dilemma was first proposed by Feng (1995). A number of other works have since appeared either employing or giving additional evidence in support of Feng’s proposal, including Chiu (1995), Cheng, Huang, Li, and Tang (1993, 1996), and Ting (1995, 1996). The essential spirit of Feng’s proposal is that Chinese passives should be analyzed on a par with current treatments of the *tough* construction in English. In the standard Principles-and-Parameters literature following Chomsky (1981), the complement of *tough* is analyzed as involving null operator (NOP) movement and predication:
This problem is easy for you to solve.

Derivationally, the object of the embedded clause is a null category that moves to the embedded [Spec, CP], from where it is then predicated on the matrix subject. The relation between the NOP and the embedded object position is one of movement; its relation with the matrix subject is one of predication, or control. The ‘tough-movement’ analysis of (1) is as depicted in (21):

According to this analysis, the structure of a passive involves both complementation and movement. It involves complementation, as *bei* selects an NP as its subject and a clausal category as its complement (which we shall assume to be an IP). It also involves movement.
of the embedded null object (which we assume to be adjunction to IP). This analysis thus incorporates a combination of the two approaches we discussed in the preceding section. It should be noted, however, that the NOP movement assumed here is an instance of A’-movement (movement to a clause-peripheral, non-argument position) and therefore differs crucially from the NP-movement assumed in the earlier approach, which is a case of A-movement (movement to subject, an argument position).

An immediate argument for (21) is that it has the virtues of both the NP-movement analysis (as represented by (3)) and the complementation analysis (as represented by (18)), but none of their problems. Recall that an important property of the passives is the obligatoryness of an empty category in object position. This property follows from the NOP analysis as much as it does from the NP-movement analysis, because both assume the existence of an object that moves away.\(^8\) The other properties, which pose problems for the NP-movement analysis, do not pose a problem for the NOP analysis. In fact they follow

\[^8\text{With respect to this property, the passive bears resemblance to sentences like the following:}\]

(i) \begin{tabular}{l}
\text{zhe-ben shu hen zhide (ni) kan.} \\
\text{this-CL book very worth (you) read} \\
‘This book is worth (your) reading.’
\end{tabular}

(ii) \begin{tabular}{l}
\text{zhe-dong fangzi xuyao xiuli.} \\
\text{this-CL house need repair} \\
‘This house needs repairing.’
\end{tabular}

In both cases the matrix verb is followed by a transitive predicate whose object is obligatorily null. It would seem that these examples could be analyzed as NOP constructions as well. Whether or not this may work out remains to be seen.
from the NOP analysis as much as they do from the complementation analysis. For example, since the subject is assigned a theta role of its own (Experiencer), a subject-oriented adverb can be used in a Chinese passive sentence. The analysis also claims that the NP following bei is a subject that forms a clausal constituent with the following VP, but does not form a constituent with the morpheme bei. It thus explains why the bei + NP sequence cannot move like a PP or serve as a nominal modifier. The coordination test confirms the hypothesis embodied in (21) that the NP-VP sequence forms a constituent. Finally, the fact that the Agent NP may antecede the subject-oriented anaphor ziji follows because the Agent is a subject of the embedded IP. Note that the combination of these properties follows from the NOP analysis, but not from the NP-movement or the complementation analysis alone.

Note that the structure (21) differs from (18) in how the coindexing relation between the subject of bei and the null object of the lower verb is established. According to the pure complementation approach represented by (18), this relation is established directly, so that the subject of bei directly binds the embedded null object. According to the NOP analysis, this relation is established indirectly: the null object is first adjoined to IP and it is from this IP-adjoined position that it gets bound by the matrix subject, as an instance of predication. Is the NOP analysis just a syntactic trick to obtain the facts reviewed so far? We shall now show that the NOP analysis is in fact supported by important semantic and historical considerations as well, in addition to a host of other independent syntactic motivations.

What semantic difference does it make to say that one structure involves NOP movement but not the other? We suggest that an NOP structure is a predicate denoting a property, whereas a normal clausal complement is an argument denoting an entity (an event, proposition, etc.). The structure (18) shows that the verb bei is a two-place (transitive) predicate selecting two arguments. In particular, in addition to the Experiencer subject, it
selects an Event as its internal argument (complement), and uses an IP to realize that internal argument. The meaning of *bei* in this case is then approximately that of ‘undergo’ or ‘experience’. On the other hand, the claim being made about (21) is that *bei* does not select an argument as a complement. Instead, it selects a predicate, which denotes a property. The *bei* in (21) is thus intransitive, with only one argument. There are two predicates, the primary predicate *bei*, and the secondary predicate realized by the NOP structure. By coindexing the NOP with the matrix subject (a case of prediction or “strong binding” of Chomsky 1986a), the NOP structure is interpreted as the secondary predicate of that subject.

How does NOP movement turn a propositional (IP) argument (as in (18)) into a predicate (as is claimed in (21))? The answer comes from the general conception of NOP movement as the syntactic correlate of “lambda-abstraction” commonly assumed in the semantic literature. An expression like “Zhangsan hit him” (where *him* may be expressed by a null pronoun as in (18)) is a closed category with no open argument positions, and it denotes a proposition (or a truth value). A lambda-abstracted expression containing exactly one free variable is equivalent to an intransitive predicate, where exactly one argument position is unsaturated. Thus, the lambda expression x (. . . x . . .), which can be informally read as “is an x such that . . . x . . .,” denotes the set of individuals \{x\} such that “. . . x . . .” is true. Any NP denoting the individual that fits this description is said to be the (semantic) subject of this predicate. We can turn a proposition into a predicate describing the property of one of its arguments by substituting into the argument’s position a variable bound by the lambda operator. The NOP movement has exactly this effect. Thus the embedded IP in (18) expresses the *proposition* that Lisi hit him, but the NOP clause in (21) expresses “the *property* of being an x such that Lisi hit x”. General requirements of predication (e.g., that a predicate must be related to a subject--cf. Williams 1980, Chomsky 1982, 1986a), and
general locality conditions (e.g., Minimal Distance Principle, etc.) ensure that the null operator is coindexed with the matrix subject, and the embedded predicate headed by the null operator is said to be a secondary predicate of the matrix subject.

Now, if bei in (18) has the meaning of ‘undergo [an event]’, an appropriate paraphrase of the bei in (21) would be ‘get, acquire, or end up with the property of . . . .’ According to (18), Zhangsan underwent an event in which Lisi hit him. According to (21), Zhangsan ended up with the property of being an x such that Lisi hit x. What is the difference between these two paraphrases? Not much as far as informal paraphrasing goes, but in a theory of syntax-semantics interface they correspond to, or are mapped from, different syntactic representations that are motivated by both synchronic and diachronic considerations. The two different syntactic structures (18) and (21) make different claims about the “lexical strength” (i.e., transitivity) of the verb bei. In (18) bei is a transitive verb with two arguments. In (21) bei is an intransitive with one argument and a secondary predicate. In the latter case, we may consider bei and the secondary predicate to make up an intransitive complex predicate which compositionally selects the subject as its single argument.⁹ On the other hand, in (18) bei is treated as a true transitive main verb with a clausal complement. The different syntactic structures make different predictions concerning the properties of passive sentences, and as we have seen, (21) but not (18) correctly predicts the obligatoriness of a null object in passive constructions like (1). We shall see shortly below that (21) makes several other correct predictions that (18) does not.

In addition to synchronic considerations, distinguishing between the two structures

---

⁹ In this case, because of its light functional load, bei comes close to having the status of an auxiliary (or light verb), giving the NOP-clause the status of the main predicate.
(18) and (21) is also diachronically justified. There is good reason to believe that these structures reflect two different stages of grammaticalization in the historical development of the passive construction. In particular, as documented by Wei (1994), the (long) passive has undergone a gradual development through the grammaticalization of bei that can be traced through historical texts. Sentences with bei-NP-VP structure started out without the requirement that the VP contain any item anaphoric to the subject of bei, and then developed into a stage where the VP regularly contained an overt pronoun during the Medieval Period as described in Wei (1994) and Peyraube (1996), and finally reached the stage (post-Tang Dynasty) where the pronoun became impossible, as we have observed in Modern Chinese. Some passive sentences from Medieval Chinese (of the Jin Dynasty) are given below:

(22) qi caiwu bei yin nuren xi duoqu zhi. (Shengjing)
    his wealth BEI whorly woman all grabbed it
    ‘His wealth was all snapped up [it] by the whorly woman.’

(23) tiannü bei chi-zhu jian zhi. (Soushenji.Tiankunlun)
    fairies BEI pool-owner see them
    ‘The fairies were seen [them] by the pool-owners.’

These examples contrast with (1) and (5a-b), repeated below:

(1) Zhangsan bei Lisi da-le.
    Zhangsan BEI Lisi hit-LE
    ‘Zhangsan was hit by Lisi.’
(5a-b) *Zhangsan bei Lisi da-le ta/ziji.

Zhangsan bei Lisi hit-le him/self

‘*Zhangsan was hit by Lisi.’

It seems that (18) would be an appropriate analysis of passive sentences in Medieval Chinese as represented by (22)-(23), except that the coreference between the embedded object and the matrix subject is simply established by pronominal anaphora, but (21) is the proper analysis for the passives in Modern (possibly also Pre-Modern) Chinese with an obligatory null object. The bei sentences in Medieval Chinese are just experiential sentences involving a two-place experiential predicate bei, but the bei sentences in Modern Chinese are true passives with an intransitive complex predicate.

In short, the postulation of the structure (21) as distinct from (18) is justified not only on syntactic and semantic grounds, but also on historical considerations. Inasmuch as we need the structure (18) to describe the earlier language, we also need the structure (21) to bring out the difference of the modern language.

4.1.3. Further Evidence for the NOP Analysis

In addition to solving all the problems associated with either the NP-movement approach or the complementation approach, the analysis embodying NOP movement receives important independent evidence from the following facts.

4.1.3.1. Long-Distance Passives

First, Chinese passives exhibit “unbounded” dependency. As observed by Huang (1974),
passives of the following sort are well-formed in Chinese, quite unlike English passives.\(^\text{10}\)

(24)  Zhangsan bei Lisi pai jingcha zhua-zou-le.

\begin{tabular}{llll}
Zhangsan & BEI & Lisi & send \textbf{police} \textbf{arrest-LE} \\
\end{tabular}

‘Zhangsan was “sent-police-to-arrest” by Lisi.’

(25)  nei-feng xin bei wo jiao Lisi qing Wangwu tuo ta meimei ji-zou-le.

\begin{tabular}{llllllll}
that-\textbf{CL} & letter & BEI & me & tell & Lisi & ask & Wangwu & entrust \textbf{his sister} \textbf{send-LE} \\
\end{tabular}

‘That letter was “told-LS-to-ask-WW-get-his-sister-to-send” by me.’

According to (24), for example, Zhangsan was arrested by the police, but it was Lisi who sent the police to arrest him. So the true Agent of the entire event is Lisi, with the police being the Agent of a sub-event of the event that Zhangsan underwent. A more idiomatic translation of (24) into English might be “Zhangsan underwent Lisi’s sending the police to arrest him” (and the police were successful in making the arrest). Similarly, in (25) the Patient is the letter, but the Agent of the entire event that the letter underwent is \textbf{wo ‘I’, not ‘his sister’, the sender.}

As is well known, unbounded dependencies are a characteristic property of A’-movement. Given NOP movement as a case of A’-movement, long-distance

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\(^\text{10}\)] Long distance passivization was first observed by Huang (1974), who proposed that the movement was directly into the subject position of the main clause, as the notion of NOP movement was not available at the time. It was not until Feng (1995) that an explicit NOP-movement account was proposed. Huang also developed an account involving reanalysis without an intermediate step of NOP-movement. It seems that both NOP movement and reanalysis are necessary in order to capture a mismatch between Case and thematic properties of the passives.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
passivization is entirely expected. It is also well known that English *tough* sentences also exhibit long-distance dependencies:

(26) This problem is too easy for me to ask the teacher to help me solve.

### 4.1.3.2. Island Sensitivity

A second piece of evidence in favor of the NOP movement analysis is that Chinese long-distance passives exhibit island effects, thus passing another diagnostic for A’-movement (cf. Chomsky 1977a).

(27) Zhangsan bei wo tongzhi Lisi ba zanmei *(ta) de shu dou mai-zou-le.

Zhangsan BEI me inform Lisi BA praise (him) DE book all buy-away-LE

‘Zhangsan had me inform Lisi to buy up all the books that praise [him].’

The sentence is ungrammatical with a gap in the object position following ‘praise’, the verb of the relative clause modifying ‘books’, though it is well-formed with a resumptive pronoun in that position. There is no similar deletion analysis that would account for this distribution of an empty object by allowing long-distance dependency but not into a complex NP. This distribution is strongly symptomatic of A’-movement.

### 4.1.3.3. The Particle *suo*

A third piece of additional evidence comes from the distribution of the particle *suo*. As observed in Chiu (1995), in somewhat literary speech, a passive sentence may include the particle *suo* before the lower verb:
(28) zhexie shiqing bu neng bei tamen suo liaojie.
      these thing not can BEI they SUO understand
      ‘These things cannot be understood by them.’

(29) ni zuijin dui ta de xingwei kongpa hui bei wairen suo chixiao
      you recent to him DE behavior afraid will BEI others SUO laugh-at
      ‘I’m afraid your recent behavior toward him will be laughed at by others.’

It is generally accepted that this *suo* is a remnant of Classical Chinese. It is also well known that the only other construction that involves this particle *suo* is the relative clause, specifically only when an object is relativized. An example of Modern Chinese relativization with *suo* is given below:

(30) xiaotou suo meiyou touzou __ de naxie shu zai zhuozishang
      thief SUO not-have steal __ DE those book at table-top
      ‘The books that the thieves have not stolen are on the table.’

A widely accepted analysis of *suo* in the traditional literature treats *suo* on a par with an (object) relative pronoun since *suo* literally means ‘location’, which is often used to refer to the “objective entity.” Whether *suo* should be equated with a relative pronoun in English-type languages (where it occurs in Spec, CP) is controversial. What is uncontroversial is that such Chinese relative clauses exhibit A’-dependency involving an empty object position. The fact that the Passive construction is the only other construction with *suo* and an accompanying empty object position then provides striking support for the
idea that Chinese passives involve A’-movement of the object. In fact, Chiu (1995) argues strongly that the suo is triggered by the existence of wh-movement in both cases. (See also Ting 2003 for related discussion.)

4.1.3.4. Resumptive Pronouns

Finally, the distribution of resumptive pronouns in Chinese passives also puts them together with relative clauses as instances of A’-movement. Earlier we highlighted the requirement that the passive must contain an object position with null content. Although this empty object requirement is true with simple sentences of the sort we have considered above, it is in fact possible to use a pronoun instead, when the object occurs within a somewhat more complex environment. We have just seen an example where such a pronoun is used, in (27), to avoid an island violation. The following example (of the sort cited in Feng 1995) allows a pronoun in the object position bound by the subject.

(31) Zhangsan bei Lisi da-le ta yi-xia.

Zhangsan bei Lisi hit-le him once.

‘Zhangsan was hit once by Lisi.’

Under the NP-movement approach, the grammaticality of (31) would be entirely unexpected.\textsuperscript{11} Under the A’-movement approach, however, the overt pronoun is simply a

\textsuperscript{11}According to Chomsky’s (1981) binding theory, an NP-trace is an anaphor which must be bound in its governing category. A pronoun in place of the NP-trace would require it to be also free in its governing category, an impossible requirement to satisfy. Hence NP-traces cannot alternate with overt pronouns at all. In fact, there is a more general property of the NP-trace, namely it cannot alternate with any overt category,
resumptive pronoun, which is locally A’-bound but locally A-free. Note that (31) differs from the ungrammatical (5a), repeated below, only in that the verb phrase in (31) is longer than that in (5a).  

(5) a. *Zhangsan bei Lisi da-le ta.
    Zhangsan bei Lisi hit-le him
    ‘Zhangsan was hit (*him) by Lisi.’

We do not know exactly why the additional material in (31) makes a pronoun possible, but we do know that the same effect can be observed with relative clauses. Thus simple object (or subject) relativization requires the gap strategy, whereas a resumptive pronoun strategy may be used when the relativized NP is surrounded by more materials.

and this property comes from Case-theoretic considerations, independently of the binding theory.

12 Feng (1995) highlighted the grammaticality of (31) as evidence that Chinese passives do not require an empty object position, but he ignored the ungrammaticality of simple sentences like (5a), where a resumptive pronoun is prohibited. His argument thus remained incomplete because the requirement of a null object in simple everyday passives was left unexplained.

13 The literature on relativization strategies in Chinese is somewhat controversial. Sanders and Tai (1972) claim that the ‘gap’ strategy is required only when the relativized NP is the matrix subject of the relative clause; all other relativized NPs can, or must, take the ‘pronoun’ strategy. Mei (1978a) claims that direct object relatives also require the gap strategy, though indirect objects may employ the pronoun strategy. My judgment agrees with that of Mei’s. The more relevant point here is that (33) with *yi-xia ‘once’ is better than (32) without it. The grammatical (33) and (31) would be on a par with cases of indirect object relativization and passivization, respectively, where the ‘indirect object’ may be a benefactor or an Affectee:
(32) ??Lisi da-le ta de nei-ge ren lai-le.
   Lisi hit-LE him DE that-CL person come-LE.
   (Lit.: ‘The person who Lisi hit him came.’)
(33) Lisi da-le ta yi-xia de nei-ge ren lai-le.
   Lisi hit-LE him once DE that-CL person come-LE
   ‘The person who Lisi hit [him] once came.’

Note that the contrast between (32) and (33) parallels that between (5a) and (31). This parallelism is quite extensive and complete. For example, an optional resumptive pronoun is possible when an embedded subject is passivized or relativized:

(34) Zhangsan bei Lisi huaiyi (ta) tou-le qian.
    Zhangsan BEI Lisi suspect (he) steal-LE money
    ‘Zhangsan was suspected (by Lisi) [he] to have stolen the money.’
(35) Lisi huaiyi (ta) tou-le qian de nei-ge ren zou-le.

(i) Lisi song-le ta liang-ben shu de na-ge ren zou-le.
    Lisi give-LE him two-CL book DE that-CL person leave-LE
    ‘The person who Lisi gave [him] two books left.’
(ii) Lisi tou-le ta liang-ben shu de na-ge ren zou-le.
    Lisi steal-LE him two-CL book DE that-CL person leave-LE
    ‘The person who Lisi stole two books left.’
(iii) Zhangsan bei Lisi tou-le ta liang-bai kuai qian
    Zhangsan BEI Lisi steal-LE him two-hundred dollar money
Lisi suspect (he) steal-LE money DE that-CL person leave-LE  
‘The person that Lisi suspected [he] stole the money has left.’

And when an object immediately following *ba* (or any element traditionally analyzed as a preposition) is passivized or relativized, a resumptive pronoun is required:

(36) Zhangsan bei Lisi ba ta pian de tuantuanzhuan.  
Zhangsan BEI Lisi BA him cheat DE run-around  
‘Zhangsan was pushed around like a fool by Lisi.’

(37) Lisi ba ta pian de tuantuanzhuan de nei-ge ren zou-le.  
Lisi BA him cheat DE run-around DE that-CL person leave-LE  
‘The person that Lisi pushed around like a fool has left.’

It is well known that the option of using the resumptive pronoun strategy is a property of A’ movement, not of A-movement.\(^\text{14}\) The fact that passivization parallels relativization so neatly in this respect lends important support to the A’ movement analysis of the passives.

In summary, an NOP analysis of Chinese (long) passives has the merits of both the NP movement and the pure complementation approaches but none of their problems, and it receives independent motivation from considerations of long-distance dependency, island sensitivity, and the distribution of resumptive pronouns and the particle *suo*.

\[^{14}\text{In addition to Case and Theta Theory, (36) would also be excluded by Binding Theory under an A-movement approach. The resumptive pronoun *ta* would be A-bound by *Zhangsan* in this case in its governing category, in violation of Condition B.}\]
4.2. The Mandarin Short Passive

In the literature on Chinese syntax, one common assumption about the short passive (as in (2), repeated below) has been that it is derived from the long form (as in (1)) via deletion of the Agent NP (see, for example, Hashimoto 1987 and references cited there).

(1)  Zhangsan bei Lisi da-le.

Zhangsan BEI Lisi hit-LE

‘Zhangsan was hit by Lisi.’

(2)  Zhangsan bei da-le.

Zhangsan BEI hit-LE

‘Zhangsan was hit.’

While this seems an easy way to relate the two constructions, there are numerous reasons to reject such an analysis. Huang (1982b) pointed out that this analysis is inappropriate on both interpretive considerations and independent syntactic grounds. Wei (1994) argued that deriving the short passive in this way would be excluded by crucial historical evidence. Comparison with properties of the long passives also leads to the same conclusion (as briefly alluded to in Cheng et al. 1993 and argued independently in Ting 1995, 1996). Let us consider these arguments in turn.

4.2.1. Against the Agent-Deletion Analysis

4.2.1.1. Accessibility
First, note that the Agent is located in a position that is generally inaccessible to deletion. This is true regardless of whether bei is analyzed as a preposition or as a verb. As a preposition, bei would permit no deletion of the Agent NP, given the general prohibition against preposition stranding as illustrated in (38)-(39):

(38)  Zhangsan, zhe-jian shi gen *(ta) mei-you guanxi.
     Zhangsan this-CL thing with *(him) not-have relation
     ‘Zhangsan, this thing has nothing to with him.’

(39)  zhe-jian shi gen *(ta) mei-you guanxi de na-ge ren zou-le.
     this-CL thing with *(him) not-have relation DE that-CL person leave-LE
     ‘The person such that this thing has nothing to do with him has left.’

As a verb, the environment in which bei occurs (a V-NP-V configuration) also does not allow the Agent NP to be deleted (whether the NP is a constituent of the higher clause or the subject of the lower clause), as illustrated below.\textsuperscript{15}

(40)  *Zhangsan, wo shi __ shengqi le.
     Zhangsan I cause __ angry LE

\textsuperscript{15} In the speech of some speakers from northern China, sentences with rang ‘let’ exceptionally allow extraction in the context of (40)-(41):

(i)  Zhangsan, wo rang __ ca chuanghu qu-le.
     Zhangsan I let __ wipe window go-LE
     ‘Zhangsan, I had him go and wipe the windows.’
‘Zhangsan, I have caused to be angry.’

(41) *Li Xiaojie, wo bi __ gaijia le.

Miss Li I force __ re-marry LE

‘Miss Li, I have forced to re-marry.’

If the short passive were derived from the long passive by deletion of the Agent, it would constitute an unexplained exception to the otherwise general prohibition.

4.2.1.2. Chronology of Emergence

Independently arguing against Hashimoto’s Agent deletion hypothesis, Wei (1994) pointed out that the short passive was used as early as 300 B.C. (e.g., in the text of Han Feizi), much earlier than the long passive form, which was not attested until 500 years later, in Han texts (ca. 200 A.D.). Two examples of the short form are found in the following quote from Han Feizi:

(42) jin xiongdi bei qin, bi gong zhe, lian ye;

now brothers BEI attack, must attack person, straight SFP;

zhi you bei ru, sui chou zhe, zhen ye.

know friends BEI insult, along angry person, loyal SFP

‘Now those who will attack when their brothers are attacked are straight; those who, when their best friends are insulted, will be likewise angry, are loyal.’

Since the long passive form did not exist at this stage, any attempt to derive the short
passives from underlying long passives would be extremely unsatisfactory.

4.2.1.3. Obligatory Null Object

A related point has to do with the requirement of a null object. As indicated in connection with (22)-(23), the long passive developed from experiential sentences through grammaticalization of the experiential verb beī. Prior to its current form represented by (1), many earlier examples of the passive construction involved an overt pronoun in the embedded clause bound by the subject of beī. Additional Medieval Chinese examples are given below (from Jin texts cited in Feng 1998):

(43)  (Li Zi’ao) beī ming-he  tun  zhi.  (from Soushenji)
     Li Zi’ao  beī chirping-cranes wallow him
     ‘Li Zi’ao was swallowed (him) by the chirping crane.’

(44)  Jindan  ruo beī zhuwu   fan   zhi   …  (from Baopuzi)
     Jindan  if  beī everything attack him
     ‘If Jindan was attacked (him) by everything …’

The requirement of a null object is in fact a relatively recent property of the long passive. On the other hand, the short passive has always involved an obligatory null object position from the very start in 300 B.C. Needless to say, this makes deriving the short passive from the long passive synchronically even less plausible.

4.2.1.4. Adverbial Positions

From a purely synchronic viewpoint, a number of differences also exist between the long
and the short passives that argue against the Agent deletion analysis. One is that although sentential adverbials as well as VP adverbials are allowed with long passives, only VP-adverbials may occur with the short form. Thus, (45) shows that both manner and place adverbials may occur with the long form, whereas (46) shows that the short form admits only manner adverbials:

(45)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Zhangsan bei Lisi momingqimiao de pian-zou-le.  
Zhangsan be Lisi confused DE abduct-LE  
‘Zhangsan was abducted in a state of confusion by Lisi.’  
\item b. Zhangsan bei Lisi zai xuexiao pian-zou-le.  
Zhangsan be Lisi at school abduct-LE  
‘Zhangsan was abducted at school by Lisi.’
\end{enumerate}

(46)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Zhangsan bei momingqimiao de pian-zou-le.  
Zhangsan be confused DE abduct-LE  
‘Zhangsan was abducted in a state of confusion.’  
\item b. *Zhangsan bei zai xuexiao pian-zou-le.  
Zhangsan be at school abduct-LE  
‘Zhangsan was abducted at school.’
\end{enumerate}

This suggests that while the long passive contains an IP following *bei, the short passive contains a VP in that position. An analysis employing Agent deletion from the long passive would entail an IP containing a null subject position, but then it would be unclear why such a structure could not accommodate a locative adverbial.
4.2.1.5. Long-Distance Possibilities

Earlier we saw that the long passives exhibit unbounded dependencies subject to island constraints (as in (47)). By contrast, short passives are strictly local, disallowing any cross-clausal dependency (48):

(47)  
\[ a. \text{Zhangsan bei Lisi pai jingcha zhua-zou le.}\]  
\[ \text{Zhangsan BEI Lisi send police arrest LE} \]  
\[ \text{‘Zhangsan was ‘sent-police-to-arrest’ by Lisi.’} \]  
\[ b. \text{nei-feng xin bei wo jiao Lisi qing Wangwu tuo ta meimei ji-zou le.}\]  
\[ \text{that-CL letter BEI me tell Lisi ask Wangwu request his sister send LE} \]  
\[ \text{‘That letter was ‘told-LS--ask-WW--have-his-sister-send’ by me.’} \]

(48)  
\[ a. *\text{Zhangsan bei pai jingcha zhua-zou le.}\]  
\[ \text{Zhangsan BEI send police arrest LE.} \]  
\[ b. *\text{nei-feng xin bei jiao Lisi qing Wangwu tuo ta meimei ji-zou le.}\]  
\[ \text{that-CL letter BEI tell Lisi ask Wangwu request his sister send LE} \]

We saw that unbounded dependencies and island sensitivity constitute an important diagnostic for A’-movement in the analysis of long passives. The lack of such unbounded dependencies with the short passive suggests that it does not involve A’-movement and hence argues against the hypothesis that the short passive is simply obtained by Agent deletion.

4.2.1.6. The Particle suo

We saw above that, in some semi-literary styles, long passives may contain the particle
suo (as in (28)-(29), repeated below), a property they share with relative clauses. This is taken to provide evidence for A’-movement.

(28) zhhexie shiqing bu neng bei tamen suo liaojie.
these thing not can BEI they SUO understand
‘These things cannot be understood by them.’

(29) ni zuijin dui ta de xingwei kongpa hui bei wairen suo chixiao
you recent to him DE behavior afraid will BEI others SUO laugh-at
‘I’m afraid your recent behavior toward him will be laughed-at by others.’

By contrast, the short passive disallows suo in both spoken and literary styles:16

(49) *zhhexie shiqing bu neng bei ___ suo liaojie.
these thing not can BEI ___ SUO understand
‘These things cannot be understood.’

(50) *ni zuijin dui ta de xingwei kongpa hui bei ___ suo chixiao
you recent to him DE behavior afraid will BEI ___ SUO laugh-at
‘I’m afraid your recent behavior toward him will be laughed at.’

16 A related construction in Classical Chinese involving wei rather than bei is grammatical with suo but without the Agent phrase: bu wei suo dong ‘was not moved [by it]’. Though this looks like a ‘short passive’ with suo, it should be noted that this ‘short passive’ differs from the pattern under discussion in the text. This example involves true deletion of the agent NP whose reference is clear in context, and so it is better translated as ‘was not moved by it’, not ‘was not moved’, which would be appropriate for a short passive we are considering in the text. See Wei (1994) for related remarks.
This contrast again would be unaccounted for under a simple Agent deletion analysis.

4.2.1.7. Resumptive Pronouns

Finally, the long and short passives also contrast with respect to the distribution of resumptive pronouns. A long passive may employ the pronoun strategy in cases like (31), repeated below:

(31)  Zhangsan bei Lisi da-le ta yi-xia.

    Zhangsan BEI Lisi hit-LE him once.
    ‘Zhangsan was hit once by me.’

But a short passive does not admit any resumptive pronoun under similar circumstances:\textsuperscript{17}

(51)  *Zhangsan bei da-le ta yi-xia.

    Zhangsan BEI hit-LE him once.

\textsuperscript{17} The following agentless short passive does allow a resumptive pronoun within a ‘retained object’:

(i)  Zhangsan bei qiang-zou-le ta zui xihuan de wanju.

    Zhangsan BEI take-away-LE he most like DE toy

    ‘Zhangsan had the toy he liked most taken away.’

We argue below that passive forms like this involve the passivization of an ‘outer object’ of a V’ phrase, in this case the phrase qiang-zou-le ta zui xihuan de wanju. In other words, the pronoun ta in (i) is anaphoric to the
‘Zhangsan was hit once.’

This suggests again that the derivation of the short passive must be very different from that of the long passive.

4.2.2. Analysis of the Short Passive

In view of the large number of arguments presented above, it is clear that a short passive cannot be treated as an Agent-deleted version of the long passive. Two possibilities for analyzing the short passive come to mind: it could involve NP-movement in some fashion, or it could be derived without any movement.

Some of the contrastive properties we have just seen—those concerning (the lack of) unbounded dependencies, resumptive pronouns, and suo--suggest that although the short passive does not involve A’-movement, an analysis in terms of A-movement of the sort used in English be-passives might be appropriate. This is in fact the analysis adopted by Ting (1995, 1996), according to whom the surface subject of the short passive is derived via movement of the underlying object into the Spec of IP position. However, such an analysis ignores the fact that both the long and the short passives, but not the English be passive, may contain a subject-oriented adverb like guyi ‘intentionally’, as we saw in (6) and (7) as repeated below, which suggests that the subject is base-generated in place and receives an independent thematic role from bei.

(6) Zhangsan guyi bei da-le.

---

moved ‘outer object’, but is not directly related to Zhangsan as its resumptive pronoun.
Zhangsan intentionally BEI hit-LE

‘Zhangsan intentionally got hit.’

(7) Zhangsan guyi bei Lisi da-le.

Zhangsan intentionally BEI Lisi hit-LE

‘Zhangsan intentionally got hit by Lisi.’

For this reason, a more reasonable analysis might take the form depicted in (52) (following Hoshi’s (1991, 1994a,b) analysis of English get-passives and Japanese “ni-passives”):\(^{18}\)

(52)

According to this analysis, \textit{bei} has the status of a deontic modal auxiliary or light verb, selecting an Experiencer as its subject and a predicate (a property) as its complement, and subcategorizing for a VP as the structural realization of the predicate complement.

\(^{18}\) Hoshi indicates that this was an adaptation of a similar analysis of \textit{be}-passives in English proposed earlier by Saito and Murasugi (1989).
Following the Predicate Internal Subject Hypothesis (Contreras 1987, Sportiche 1988, Fukui and Speas 1986, Kitagawa 1986, Kuroda 1988, etc.), a VP contains a subject position of its own. The VP itself is a passive structure with internal NP-movement as shown above, with the underlying Patient argument moved into the non-thematic [Spec, VP] position, binding a trace. The moved Patient is itself an empty category, a PRO, which is controlled by the base-generated subject *Lisi*. Thus the short passive has a structure somewhat parallel to that of the long passive, except that while the long passive involves the A’-movement of an NOP which is then coindexed with the matrix subject under predication, the short passive involves the A-movement of a PRO which is then controlled by the subject. It is easy to see that all the properties considered so far of the short passive follow from this analysis.

First, because we assume that the auxiliary-like *bei* selects a VP (rather than IP), it follows that only manner adverbs (which can be adjoined to V’ or VPs) may occur in short passives, to the exclusion of sentential adverbs (which must be adjoined to I’ or IP). Secondly, because it assigns an independent Experiencer role to its subject, it follows that adverbs like *guyi* ‘intentionally’ are allowed. Thirdly, because the short passive involves NP-movement, unbounded dependencies, resumptive pronouns and *suo* are correctly excluded. Furthermore, because it does not involve deletion of an Agent phrase from the embedded subject position, the problem of accessibility does not arise. And finally, since this structure is postulated independently of the NOP structure of the long passive, the relative chronology of these two passive forms again poses no problem for our analysis.  

---

19 Another argument for not relating the long and short passives by derivation comes from dialectal comparison. For example, (spoken) Cantonese and Taiwanese, whose passives are formed with a different morpheme than that corresponding to Mandarin *bei*, have no equivalents of the short passive. For more details see Huang (1999) and Tang (1999).
While this NP-movement-plus-control analysis seems quite elegant for the cases of the short passive we have considered, it is not the only possible analysis for the Agent-less passive. It has been noted by Shen (1992) and Ting (1996), among others, that certain short passives must be derived by a lexical process, illustrated by (53):

(53)  Zhangsan bei bu-le.

Zhangsan BEI arrest-LE

‘Zhangsan was arrested.’

(54)  dijun bei fu-le.

enemy BEI capture-LE

‘The enemy troops got captured.’

In these cases, the verb directly following *bei* is a bound morpheme. Contrast *bei bu* with *bei daibu*:

(55)  a.  jingcha daibu-le Zhangsan.

police arrest-LE Zhangsan

‘The police arrested Zhangsan.’

b.  Zhangsan bei jingcha daibu-le.

Zhangsan BEI police arrest-LE

‘Zhangsan was arrested by the police.’

c.  Zhangsan bei jingcha mimide daibu-le.

Zhangsan BEI police secretly arrest-LE

‘Zhangsan was secretly arrested by the police.’
d.  women xuexiao bei jingcha daibu-le liang-ge xuesheng.
    our school BEI police arrest-LE two-CL student
    ‘Zhangsan had two students arrested by the police.’

(56) a.  *jingcha bu-le Zhangsan.
       police arrest-LE Zhangsan

b.  *Zhangsan bei jingcha bu-le.
    Zhangsan BEI police arrest-LE

c.  *Zhangsan bei jingcha mimide bu-le.
    Zhangsan BEI police secretly arrest-LE

d.  *Zhangsan bei jingcha bu-le liang-ge xuesheng.
    Zhangsan BEI police arrest-LE two-CL student

Cases like (53)-(54) must therefore be derived by a lexical process that directly combines
bei with a verb to make a ‘passive verb’.

It seems clear that the reason why the short passive has both a lexical and a phrasal
form has to do with its history dating back, as indicated, to late Archaic Chinese, when the
language was highly monosyllabic. At first, bei was used as an alternative for the passive
marker jian (which soon gave way to bei):

(57)  wu chang jian xiao yu dafang zhi jia.  (Zhuangzi.Qiushui)
    I often get laughed by large-expertise DE²⁰ scholar

²⁰ Classical Chinese zhi is glossed as DE here in so far as the specific instances are equivalent to the
prenominal modifier marker de.
‘I often got laughed at by the great experts.’

(58) wan-sheng zhi guo bei wei yu Zhao.

10,000-vehicle DE state BEI surround by Zhao

‘A state of ten thousand chariots got surrounded by Zhao.’

These sentences in Archaic Chinese could be related to their Modern counterparts in the following ways. On the one hand, bei, like jian, could be an auxiliary taking a VP complement whose subject theta-role is suppressed. These sentences would be like the English get passives, properly analyzed as in (52) above (à la Hoshi). The main difference between the Archaic (57)-(58) and the modern (52) is that historically, the Agent appeared as a postverbal PP headed by yu, but is completely missing in the modern short passive. We can say that the modern short passives are directly inherited from Archaic passives, and the absence of a postverbal agent phrase is simply part of an independent historical development of the language—the disappearance adjunct PPs from postverbal position.\(^1\) This leaves the question of why some short passives are phrasal while others are lexical in Modern Chinese. We believe that this situation is the result of another well known historical development whereby the language became highly disyllabic (and highly analytic in other ways). If the verb became disyllabic (as in daibu ‘arrest’), it continued to head a VP structure under the auxiliary bei, and kept the template available for later development as a full phrasal short passive. If the verb remained monosyllabic, it needed to combine with the auxiliary bei (for prosodic reasons, see Feng 1994, 2000) to form a disyllabic unit, with the result that bei

---

\(^1\) See Sun (1996) and references cited therein for indication that the postverbal adjunct PPs did not ‘move’ historically to the preverbal position; they simply fell into disuse in postverbal position.
became the first element of a V-V compound or a prefix to the verb, as in *bei bu* ‘get arrested’, *bei fu* ‘get captured’ in (53) and (54). When the monosyllabic forms of these verbs fell in disuse (and replaced by *daibu* ‘arrest’ and *fulu* ‘capture’), they became bound morphemes and could not appear in the environments in (56). In other words, the modern lexical short passives are frozen forms of historical phrasal passives.\(^{22}\)

Whether or not the details of its history are correct, it seems quite certain that the short passive is not simply an Agent-deleted version of a long passive. The short passive in Modern Chinese is handed down from the Archaic passive construction. The phrasal short passive seems to retain the NP-movement properties of Archaic passives whereas the lexical passive appears to have been fossilized from Archaic forms that were once phrasal.

Summarizing, we have argued that there are (at least) two ways to derive passive sentences in Chinese. The long passive involves the main verb *bei* with a clausal complement which undergoes null-operator movement and type-shifts into a property predicated on the Experiencer subject. The short passive involves an auxiliary-like *bei* with a VP complement whose PRO object is NP-moved and controlled by the Experiencer subject.

\[
(59) \text{Zhangsan}_i \text{ bei } [\text{IP OP}_1 [\text{IP Lisi da-le } t_i]]
\]

Logically, for a monosyllabic free form like *da* ‘hit’, a simple passive like *ta bei da le* ‘He got hit’ could involve either lexical or phrasal passive, though *ta bei da de hen teng* ‘He was hit(and was) severely (hurt)’ and *ta bei tongkuai de da-le* ‘He was soundly beaten’ require a phrasal analysis.
Both passive forms thus have the dual character of both movement and control-predication. In this respect, Chinese passives are similar to *get*-passives in English, unlike *be*-passives which involve NP-movement only. An appropriate analysis of an English *get* passive would be (61), as opposed to (62) for a corresponding *be* passive:

23 Predication and control are clearly of the same or similar nature. In Williams (1980), control is simply treated as a special case of (secondary) predication.

24 The difference between *get* and *be* passives is then the difference between control and raising verbs. As the following examples show, the distinction between *get* and *be* with respect to the distribution of subject-oriented adverbs and idiom chunks is clearly also found with familiar control vs. raising predicates.

(i) a. *John was cheated intentionally.
   b. John got cheated intentionally.

(ii) a. *John is intentionally likely to win.
   b. John is intentionally eager to win.

(iii) a. Advantage was taken of John.
   b. *?Advantage got taken of John.

(iv) a. The shit is likely to hit the fan.
   b. *The shit is eager to hit the fan.
Because they involve predication/control Chinese passives are different from the more familiar passives in English and other western languages. This also seems to be the most prominent property of passives in other East Asian languages.

4.3. The Analysis of Indirect Passives

4.3.1. Direct vs. Indirect Passives

Another prominent property of passives in East Asian languages is the existence of ‘indirect passives’. In the previous examples we have seen, the subject of a passive sentence is coindexed with the direct object of the main verb. Such are the ‘direct passive’ sentences.

---

25 The direct vs. indirect distinction has figured prominently from the early days of generative study in Japanese syntax, though it has not attracted much attention in Chinese syntax. The analysis of the various passive forms in Japanese has been a topic of considerable controversy among researchers. A major item of debate has been whether the various passive forms should be analyzed in a uniform manner or not. The uniform approach (championed by Kuroda 1965 and many others in subsequent work) postulates clausal complementation for all passive forms, with deletion of the embedded object in the case of direct passives. The non-uniform approach (Kuno 1973 inter alia) postulates clausal complementation for the indirect passives but analyses the direct passives in terms of NP-movement. As far as the direct passives are concerned, these two approaches parallel the two competing traditions in the analysis of Chinese long passives as discussed in the preceding sections. For important recent discussions on the analysis of passives in Japanese, see Kitagawa and Kuroda (1992) and Hoshi (1994a, 1994b) and references cited there. For related discussion, see Huang (1999).

26 Or that of a complement verb in cases of long-distance passivization. The one exception is (55d), which is an example of the ‘indirect passive’ under discussion here.
But the passive may also be ‘indirect’, where the subject may be related to something other than the direct object, or not to any apparent syntactic position in the main clause at all.

Borrowing Washio’s (1993) terminology, we may distinguish between two kinds of indirect passives: ‘inclusive’ and ‘exclusive’. In the first, the subject is related to some other position than the object within the predicate (such as the possessive position):

\[(63)\]  Zhangsan bei Lisi daduan-le yi-tiao tui.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Zhangsan} & \quad \text{BEI} \quad \text{Lisi} \quad \text{hit-break-LE} \quad \text{one-CL} \quad \text{leg} \\
\text{‘Zhangsan had a leg [of his] broken by Lisi.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(64)\]  Zhangsan bei tufei qiang-zou-le san-jian xingli.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Zhangsan} & \quad \text{BEI} \quad \text{bandit} \quad \text{rob-away-LE} \quad \text{3-CL} \quad \text{luggage} \\
\text{‘Zhangsan had 3 pieces of [his] luggage robbed by the bandits.’}
\end{align*}
\]

In the second, the subject is not apparently related to any position in the predicate at all. The “exclusive” indirect passives are also known as ‘adversative passives’, because of the strong sense of adversity they convey on the part of the referents of their subjects, as illustrated below:\(^{27}\)

\[(65)\]  wo you bei ta zi-mo-le.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I} & \quad \text{again} \quad \text{BEI} \quad \text{he} \quad \text{self-touch-LE}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{27}\) Example (67) is from Shen (1992). It is the case, though, that Mandarin adversative passives are considerably less widespread than, say, Japanese adversative passives. Thus, while \(*wo bei ta ku le\) for ‘I was affected by him crying’ is not generally acceptable in Mandarin, its Japanese counterpart is perceived to be quite natural.
‘I again had him ‘self-draw’ [on me].’

(Said of a Mahjong game where one converts by drawing the last matching tile by oneself, rather than converting on an opponent’s discarded tile.)

(66) Lisi you bei Wangwu jichu-le yi-zhi quanleida.
Lisi again BEI Wangwu hit-LE one-CL home-run

‘Lisi again had Wangwu hit a home run [on him].’

(67) wo bei ta zhemo yi zuo, jiu shenme dou kan-bu-jian-le.
I BEI he thus one sit then everything all can-not-see-LE

‘As soon as I had him sitting this way [on me], I couldn’t see anything at all.’

(Said of a concert, when someone tall sits in front of me and blocks my view.)

We have analyzed the direct passives as involving both movement (A or A’) and control/predication. How should the indirect passives be analyzed? Considerations of theoretical economy would lead us to expect that they may be subject to the same or a similar analysis, involving both movement and control/predication. However, although such an analysis can be entertained for the inclusive indirect passives, it is not obvious how it can be implemented. Furthermore, for the adversative passives with no missing NP position in the main predicate, an analysis in terms of movement and control/predication seems apparently out of place. Let us take up each of these two forms in turn.

4.3.2. The Inclusive Indirect Passive

One sort of inclusive indirect passive is the ‘possessive passive,’ exemplified in (63)-(64), and (68) below.
Zhangsan bei tufei dasi-le baba.  
Zhangsan BEI bandits kill-LE father
‘Zhangsan had his father killed by the bandits.’

Similar examples are commonly found in Taiwanese and other East Asian languages:

(69) goa ho i that-tio pakto a.  
I HO him kick stomach SFP
‘I was ‘kicked [my] stomach’ by him.’

(70) John-ga Mary-ni kodomo-o sikar-are-ta.  
John-NOM Mary-DAT child-ACC scold-PASS-PAST
‘John had his child scolded by Mary.’

(71) haksayng-i sensayngnim-eykey son-ul cap-hi-ess-ta.  
student-NOM teacher-DAT hand-ACC catch-PASS-PAST-DECL
‘The student had his hand caught by the teacher.’
(The student was caught by the hand by the teacher.)

Assuming that there is indeed a null possessive phrase in the predicate coindexed with the subject of the passive verb in each of these sentences, the question arises as to how this anaphoric relationship is established. One possibility would be that the possessive phrase directly undergoes NOP movement. (To simplify discussion, we shall consider only long passives. Hence, the question will mainly concern how the sentences might be analyzed in terms of NOP movement and predication.) This ‘possessive raising’ hypothesis
must be ruled out, however, for the following reasons. First, movement out of a possessive phrase is prohibited, as this would violate Ross’ (1967) Left Branch Condition. A similar problem arises with respect to the Complex NP Constraint in the following sentence, where the supposed movement would have originated from within a relative clause:

(72) Lisi bei wo mai-zou-le [[e] zui xihuan de na-ben shu].
Lisi BEI me buy-away-LE most like DE that-CL book
‘Lisi was affected by the fact that I bought up the book that [he] liked.’

Secondly, such a movement hypothesis would leave unexplained contrasts like the one between (68) and the following marginal sentence:

(73) ??Zhangsanbei tamen kanjian-le ei baba le.
Zhangsan BEI they see-LE father LE
‘Zhangsan was affected by the fact that they saw [his] father.’

If the possessive of ‘father’ were allowed to be moved out in (68), the same movement should be allowed in (73), but (73) is considerably less natural than (68).

It has been suggested in Huang (1992), inter alia, extending an idea of Thompson (1973), that sentences like (68)-(69) should be analyzed as involving a complex predicate with an ‘outer object’ that controls the null possessor. The possessor is not a trace, but a Pro controlled by the outer object. What is moved is the outer object itself.
In this structure, the verb ‘kill’ takes the NP ‘Pro father’ as its immediate object. The verb and this object form a complex predicate V’ that takes another object, the ‘outer object’. The outer object controls the possessor Pro and is in turn NOP-moved to IP, where it is coindexed with Zhangsan under predication. (Both predication and control are subject to a Minimal Distance Principle of the sort first proposed by Rosenbaum 1970, as part of the Generalized Control Theory of Huang 1984a, 1992, inter alia.) We take the standard view that theta-role assignment is compositional. The inner object receives the Patient/Theme role from the verb dasi, and the outer object receives the Affectee role from the V’ dasi-le Pro baba.

It is easy to see that the two problems encountered by the ‘possessive raising’ hypothesis immediately disappear under the ‘outer object’ hypothesis. First, since movement does not take place directly from the possessive position or from within a relative clause, neither the LBC nor the CNPC is violated. Secondly, the contrast between (68) and
(73) receives a natural explanation. The complex predicate ‘kill one’s father’ can be
semantically transitive (taking an Affectee as an outer object) as the event can indeed affect
someone (the inalienable possessor of the father). On the other hand, the complex predicate
‘see one’s father’ (as in (73)) denotes an event that (under normal circumstances) can hardly
affect anyone and hence is hard to construe as being semantically transitive. The
marginality of (73) therefore follows from the fact that the subject Zhangsan is not related to
an Affectee of the event. The contrast observed below can be similarly explained:

(75) zhuozi bei wo da-duan-le yi-tiao [ei] tui.
    table  BEI I  hit-break-LE one-CL   leg
    ‘The table had one of its legs broken by me.’

(76) *zhuozi bei wo kanjian-le yi-tiao [ei] tui.
    table  BEI I  see-LE  one-CL   leg
    ‘*The table had one of its legs seen by me.’

Assume that an entity can be ‘affected’ in the linguistically relevant sense if it can be altered
physically or psychologically by the event in question. (75) is therefore good because a
table can be physically affected by one of its legs being broken, but (76) is bad because one
can neither physically or psychologically affect a table by seeing it. (With an animate
subject, (76) would range from marginal to acceptable, depending on the situation.) In other
words, given a complex predicate analysis, we can say that the complex predicate ‘see a leg
of’ places a selectional restriction on its outer object that it be animate. This property is not

28 Unless Zhangsan has purposely hidden his father somewhere, in which case (73) is acceptable.
one of the V ‘see’ alone, but that of the V’ complex.

What we have argued up to now is that, if inclusive indirect passives are to be derived via movement of something (NOP or PRO) into a position for predication or control, then movement must take place from an outer object position, not from a possessive position or from within a syntactic island. But is there evidence that movement actually takes place? One might contend, for example, that these sentences involve a relation of control, i.e., that the subject directly binds an empty category in a possessive position or within a relative clause. With the notion of a complex predicate, the subject can receive the Affectee theta-role compositionally, with no need for mediation or movement by an outer object.

Although this alternative view cannot be ruled out a priori, additional empirical evidence exists for the existence of an outer object (and hence movement). The first is theory-internal, bearing on the Minimal Distance Principle (MDP) alluded to above, which requires a PRO or NOP to be controlled by, or predicated on, the closest c-commanding NP. According to the MDP, the empty subject Pro in (72) (for example) is controlled by the agent wo, not by the subject Zhangsan. But this is not the intended reading of this inclusive indirect passive. With the postulation of an outer object between wo and the complex predicate V’, the correct interpretation is obtained.

The existence of an outer object can also be detected from sentences like (77):

(77) Zhang Zhenxing bei jianchaguan qiu-xing qi-nian.

Zhang Zhenxing BEI district-attorney ask-for-jail-term seven-year

‘Zhang Zhenxing had the D.A. requesting a jail term of 7 years for him.’
Although all argument positions seem to be filled already in the main predicate, note that the active IP below *bei* is itself incomplete:

\[(78)\] *jianchaguan         qiu-xing             qi-nian.  
district-attorney  ask-for-jail-term  seven-year  
‘The DA requested a jail term of 7 years.’

This sentence gives a strong sense of being an incomplete transitive sentence whose object nevertheless does not seem to fit anywhere within the complex predicate. An outer object in the form of an NP-trace in (77) provides that missing object and renders the sentence grammatical. In fact, for some speakers the following is quite acceptable with the outer object case-licensed by *ba*:

\[(79)\] jianchaguan ba Zhangsan qiu-xing qi-nian.  
district-attorney BA Zhangsan ask-for-jail-terms seven-year  
‘The DA requested a jail term of 7 years for Zhangsan.’

In Korean, evidence for an outer object comes directly from the existence of double accusative-marked sentences like the following.

\[(80)\] Mary-ka John-ul tali-lui cha-ess-ta.  
Mary-NOM John-ACC leg-ACC kick-PAST-DECL  
‘Mary kicked John in the leg.’ (Lit. ‘Mary ‘leg-kicked’ John.’)
The status of *John* as an outer object in (80), rather than as a possessive specifier of ‘leg’, is confirmed by the ungrammaticality of (81), with the predicate ‘see leg’:


Mary-NOM  John-ACC  leg-ACC  see-PAST-DECL

(Lit. ‘Mary ‘leg-saw’ John.’)

The existence of ‘double accusative’ constructions in Korean thus provides overt evidence for the outer object occurring *in situ*. As for why other languages do not also generally exhibit *in situ* outer objects, we can assume that these languages lack an appropriate device to Case-license them in their base position.

For Japanese, evidence for the outer object has been presented by Homma (1995), who independently made the same arguments regarding the notion of a natural transitive predicate, and Korean double Accusative constructions. In addition, citing Kayne (1975), Homma shows that certain Romance inalienable possessive constructions include an Affectee argument which must be accommodated in what we have dubbed the ‘outer object’ position.

Hiroto Hoshi (p.c.) pointed out another piece of support for this hypothesis from quantifier floating:

(82)  gakusei-ga  sensei-ni  san-nin  t  kino  [sakubun-o home]-rare-ta.

student-NOM  teacher-DAT  3-CL  yesterday  essay-ACC  praise-PASS-PAST

‘Three students had their essays praised by the teacher yesterday.’

(Lit. ‘Three students were ‘essay-praised’ by the teacher yesterday.’)
Note that the QP *san-nin* ‘3-classifier’, which is related to *gakusei* ‘student’, is stranded in the matrix clause, not as part of a possessive phrase modifying ‘essays’. This shows that there must be a position in construction with the floated quantifier that is external to the complex predicate ‘praise the essays’ but internal to the main VP headed by *rare*, and this is the position of the outer object.²⁹

²⁹The conclusion that certain cases of non-local (i.e. long-distance) passivization are reduced to the local passivization of an Affectee outer object raises the question of whether all apparent long-distance cases are so reducible. We think this is neither necessary nor empirically possible. For one thing, note that A’-movement cannot be dispensed with: even the locally moved outer objects have to be A’-moved, since the subject of IP is already filled. Since A’-movement can typically go long-distance (while respecting island constraints), it would be unnecessary, in fact undesirable, to suppose that all apparent cases of long-distance passivization are local passivization of the outer object. Furthermore, there are many grammatical passive sentences that can be derived by A’-movement using the resumptive pronoun strategy which could not be derived by the local movement of an outer object. We have seen with (74) that ‘kill father’ can be a complex predicate taking an Affectee as an outer object. This is further evidenced by the fact the Affectee can appear following *ba* in a *ba*-construction:

(i)  tufei ba Zhangsan [dasi-le Pro baba]
     bandit BA Zhangsan kill-LE Pro father
     ‘The bandits ‘father-killed’ Zhangsan.’

Note crucially that in a *ba* construction of this sort, where *Zhangsan* is clearly an outer object, the Pro possessor of ‘father’ cannot be replaced by a pronoun:

(ii) *tufei* ba Zhangsan [dasi-le ta baba].
Summarizing, the complex predicate analysis for the ‘inclusive’ indirect passive is

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{bandit BA Zhangsan kill-LE his father} \\
'\text{The bandits ‘killed-his-father’ Zhangsan.'}
\end{array}
\]

This prohibition does not apply to passivization, however. Thus both (iii) (=74) and (iv) are well-formed:

(iii) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Zhangsan bei tufei dasi-le baba.} \\
\text{Zhangsan BEI bandits kill-LE father} \\
'\text{Zhangsan had his father killed by the bandits.'}
\end{array}
\]

(iv) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Zhangsan bei tufei dasi-le ta-de baba.} \\
\text{Zhangsan BEI bandits kill-LE his father} \\
'\text{Zhangsan had his father killed by the bandits.'}
\end{array}
\]

This difference between the passive and the \textit{ba} construction can be accounted for if we say that (iv) is derived not by movement of an outer object, but by establishing an A’-dependency directly with the possessor using the resumptive pronoun strategy. The following contrast also shows the same point.

(v) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{*Zhangsan ba Lisi da-le ta yixia.} \\
\text{Zhangsan BA Lisi hit-LE him once} \\
'\text{Zhangsan hit Lisi once.'}
\end{array}
\]

(vi) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Lisi bei Zhangsan da-le ta yixia.} \\
\text{Lisi BEI Zhangsan hit-LE him once} \\
'\text{Lisi was hit once by Zhangsan.'}
\end{array}
\]

(v) shows that the outer object \textit{Lisi} cannot serve as the antecedent of the overt pronoun. The grammatical (vi) therefore cannot be derived by A’-movement of an outer object; an A’-dependency must be established with the possessor directly using the resumptive pronoun strategy.
supported by several independent considerations: (a) the theory of movement constraints, (b) contrasts between natural and unnatural ‘transitive complex predicates’, (c) distribution of quantifier floating, and (d) the overt existence of outer objects in some languages (e.g., Korean and Romance). Note that this analysis applies not only to long passives which involve NOP movement, but also to short passives involving PRO movement. The following are a few indirect short passives:

(83) Beida bei daibu-le san-ge xuesheng.

PKU BEI arrest-LE three-CL students

‘Peking University had three students arrested.’

(84) tamen bei qiang-zou-le zui xihuan de wanju.

they BEI rob-away-LE most like DE toy

‘They had the toys that [they] liked most robbed [from them].’

If our analysis that the short passives involve PRO movement is correct, then something must be moved into the Spec of VP below bei. Given the above considerations, it is the hypothesized outer object that is moved, but not the Possessor of ‘3 students’ in (83) or the subject of the relative clause ‘Pro liked most.’ The structure of (84), for example, is:

(85)
4.3.3. The Adversative Passive

We have argued that inclusive indirect passives should actually be analyzed as direct passives, i.e. as involving the promotion of some object, albeit an outer object. Like the direct passives, they involve both complementation and movement. Now what about the exclusive, adversative passive? The standard assumption in the literature is that this construction does not involve any movement or coindexation of any sort. The adversative passive sentence is just like a normal experiential sentence, except that the usual cases involve a neutral Experiencer, but somehow when the passive verb is used it displays a strong sense of adversity. The subject is completely ‘excluded’ in the real sense.

This standard assumption, however, is not obviously the best assumption. Our suggestion is that the adversative passives, too, can and should be treated as involving an outer object of some kind--one that is even more remote from the verb than the outer object involved in the inclusive indirect passive. For lack of a better term, let us call this adversely affected object the ‘outermost object’, and assume that it bears the theta role Indirect
Affectee. We also propose that whereas the (direct) Affectee is an object of a V’, the
Indirect Affectee is an object of the VP.\(^{30}\) Still assuming the Predicate Internal Subject
Hypothesis, an adversative passive like (66) has the following structure:

\[
\text{(86)}
\]

```
(86)  
  IP  
    NP . . .  V'  
    V    IP    NP  VP    NP    V'  
Lisi  bei  Wangwu_t [e] t_i jichu-le yi-zhi quanleida  
Lisi  BEI  Wangwu  hit-LE one-CL home-run  
```

‘Lisi had Wangwu hit a home run on him.’

In this structure, [e] is the ‘outermost object’. It is seen as an object of the VP whose subject
has raised to IP. The outermost object undergoes NOP movement and is coindexed with the
subject \textit{Lisi}.

The assumption that the ‘outer object’ is an object of the V’ and the ‘outermost
object’ the object of the VP, very elegantly characterizes the two meanings of the following
Taiwanese sentence:

\(^{30}\)In a more fine-grained event structure where the verb is fully decomposed, both the ‘object of VP’ and the
‘object of V’ are each in fact the Spec of a light verb with the elementary semantics of ‘(indirectly) affect.’
The first reading is the “inclusive indirect” reading, and the second reading is the adversative, (so-called) exclusive reading. The inclusive reading is obtained when the ‘outer object’ is adjoined to V’, where it can control the Pro possessor of ‘200 dollars’. The adversative reading is obtained with the ‘outermost object’ adjoined to VP, where it is too far away to control the Pro possessor. (Instead, the trace of the embedded subject him controls the possessor.)

The proposal to represent the adversely affected NP as the ‘outermost object’ of a predicate thus provides us with a structural account of the distinction between a neutral experiential sentence and an adversative experiential sentence and explains adversity as a property of the exclusive indirect passives. A sentence is passive if its subject has prototypical object properties. The most prototypical object is the NP bearing the Patient role. Such a situation automatically obtains when indeed a direct object that bears the Patient role is passivized. The less directly involved one is in an event, the harder it is for one to qualify as the reference of object, unless it is understood to be affected in someway.

31 The inclusive reading comes more readily than the adversative reading, but the latter is still possible. Some speakers find the adversative reading difficult to get. This is natural, for pragmatic reasons. In general, the availability of a direct passive reading of a sentence will pretty much exclude an indirect reading; and the availability of an inclusive indirect reading is much more accessible than an exclusive reading.
most typically in an adverse way. Thus when an outer object is passivized to form an inclusive indirect passive, adversity adds to its naturalness. And when an outermost object is passivized, adversity becomes a requirement. The amount of adversity required for a sentence to sound natural is inversely proportionate to the proximity of the passivized argument to the main verb.

We have thus treated all forms of the passive as inclusive passives. In fact, they are all ‘direct’ passives in the sense that they all involve the passivization of an object (inner, outer, or outermost object). At least as far as the cases we have dealt with are concerned, we have a highly uniform characterization of the East Asian type of passives: they possess basically the same properties—involving both movement and complementation. If this is correct, there ceases to be any ground for the traditional debates between uniform and non-uniform approaches.

The postulation of an ‘outermost object’ is not only justified on theoretical considerations but also supported by empirical evidence. Although in Mandarin there seems to be no grammatical active counterpart to the adversative passive, in Taiwanese it is common to use the ka construction (often said to be the Taiwanese counterpart of the Mandarin ba construction) to make an active adversative sentence. In the following active sentences, the NP immediately following ka fits perfectly the description of our ‘outermost object’:

(88) yi ka goa tsao-khi a.

he KA I run-away PRT

‘He ran away on me.’

(89) yin ka lan yiaN kui-a tiuN khi a.
they KA we win several games away PRT

‘They won several games away on us already.’

(90) goa kinazit be khimo, be lai ka i thetsa hapan.
I today not happy will come KA him earlier take-off

‘Today I’m not happy, so I will quit early for the day on him [e.g., my boss].’

(91) i chhittsa-petsa to ka goa hapan, ho goa kiong beh khisi.
He so-early then KA me take-off, cause me almost will anger-death

‘He left for the day so early on me, it almost angered me to death.’

Note that in each case the NP following ka is completely dispensable for the completeness of the sense of its predicate. The ka-NP is simply added by brute force, so to speak, to what seems to be already a complete predicate, and it is understood that the reference of the ka-NP is psychologically affected, most generally in an adverse way.32

As shown in the translation for each of (88-91), English expresses adversity by putting the Indirect Affectee within an on-PP. The status of the on-PP in English has never, as far as we know, been made clear in the literature, but in light of the Taiwanese data it

32 Sometimes a benefactive, rather than adversative, sense is present, but often with a sarcastic tone. For example, suppose someone has been bragging about his cooking, and we decide to do him a favor by accepting his invitation to dinner. The following sentence is acceptable:

(i) lan lai ka i chia chit-wan.
let’s come KA him eat one-bowl

‘Let’s eat a bowl on him.’
seems quite reasonable to treat it as an ‘outermost object’ of VPs.\textsuperscript{33}

French, too, seems to provide good evidence for the existence of an ‘outermost object’. All the following sentences convey some degree of passivity:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(92)] a. Jean s’est fait broyer par un camion.
      Jean \textit{se} got crushed by a truck.
  \item b. Jean s’est fait broyer la jambe par un camion.
      Jean \textit{se} had his leg crushed by a truck.
  \item c. Jean s’est fait broyer sa voiture par un camion.
      Jean \textit{se} had his car crushed by a truck.
  \item d. Jean s’est fait broyer la voiture de son amie par un camion.
      Jean \textit{se} had his friend’s car crushed by a truck.
  \item e. Jean s’est fait broyer la voiture de Marie par un camion.
      Jean \textit{se} had Marie’s car crushed by a truck.
\end{itemize}

Note that each sentence above contains the reflexive clitic \textit{se}. Thus, although (92) is directly translatable as ‘Jean got crushed by a truck’, a more faithful translation might be ‘Jean got himself crushed by a truck’, with the reflexive treated as the Indirect Affectee. The case for an ‘outermost object’ is even more compelling in (92b-d). Here the reflexive clitic cannot have originated as a direct argument of any verb or as a possessor of a larger NP because all syntactic positions for such functions are already lexically filled. As a result the reflexive

\textsuperscript{33} As expected from Case-theoretic considerations, the Indirect Affectee must appear within a PP. The choice of preposition \textit{on} is determined by thematic-role considerations (\textit{to} for a Goal argument, and \textit{on} for an Indirect
may be felt to be an unnecessary element that should be deleted. But the reflexive is crucially needed for the passive reading to be present—without it, these sentences would only have a causative reading. We can solve this problem by analyzing the reflexive as the ‘outermost object’ denoting the Indirect Affectee. It is the presence of an outermost object that gives rise to passivity. And since the outermost object is only indirectly affected, a sense of adversity normally accompanies this kind of passive.34

In short, we have seen that the ‘outermost object’ analysis of the adversative passive is justified on several important considerations: (a) the speakers’ intuition about the active-passive contrast; (b) the existence of overt outermost objects (in Taiwanese, English, and French), and (c) the fact that it explains adversity, tying it to the notion of prototypical objecthood. An additional advantage of the analysis is that it enables us to treat all passive forms uniformly, as direct passives formed by complementation and movement.

4.4. Summary

In this chapter we have argued for a unifying approach to the various passive forms in Chinese. All of the various passives are derived by complementation and movement. The long passives are formed by clausal complementation and A’-movement of an NOP which is then predicated on the matrix subject of bei. The short passives are formed by VP complementation and A-movement of a PRO, subject to control by the matrix subject. Contrary to earlier analyses of indirect passives, we have proposed that they are derived in a

---

34See Authier and Reed (1992) and references cited for the treatment of ‘affected datives’. Their treatments of
fashion similar to the direct passives. The difference between them lies in which object undergoes movement: a direct passive involves the movement of the inner object, while an indirect passive is formed by moving the outer or outermost object.

the reflexive clitic in (92) corresponds to what we analyze here as an ‘outermost object’