



**HAL**  
open science

# A semantic analysis of passive, causative and dative constructions in Standard Chinese

Hilary Chappell

► **To cite this version:**

Hilary Chappell. A semantic analysis of passive, causative and dative constructions in Standard Chinese. Humanities and Social Sciences. Australian National University, Canberra, 1984. English. NNT: . tel-03931746

**HAL Id: tel-03931746**

**<https://hal.science/tel-03931746v1>**

Submitted on 9 Jan 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

A SEMANTIC ANALYSIS  
OF  
PASSIVE, CAUSATIVE AND DATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS  
IN STANDARD CHINESE

Hilary Margaret Chappell

A thesis submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
of the  
Australian National University

November 1983

Except where otherwise acknowledged  
in the text, this thesis represents  
the original research of the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	
PRÉCIS	
EXPLANATORY NOTE ON THE USE OF THE TERM 'STANDARD CHINESE'	
LAYOUT OF LANGUAGE EXAMPLES	
ABBREVIATIONS FOR THE GLOSSING OF GRAMMATICAL TERMS AND MORPHEMES	
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	

I. THE TRADITIONAL ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVE

0	INTRODUCTION TO PART I	1
0.1	THE MOTIVATION FOR THE USE OF THE PASSIVE IN CHINESE	5
0.2	A NOTE ON THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PASSIVE	15
1	THE SEMANTIC AND SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF THE <u>BEI</u> PASSIVE IN GENERAL	18
1.1	ADVERSITY	18
1.1.1	Other Treatments of the Question of Adversity	18
1.1.2	Semantic Analysis	22
a.	Critique of the Verb Classification Method	25
b.	Critique of the Case Grammar Approach	30
1.1.3	Imperatives and the Passive	34
1.2	THE SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECT	39
1.3	COMPLETIVENESS	46
1.3.1	The Completive Aspect Marker <u>-le</u>	47
1.3.2	The Durative Aspect Marker <u>-zhe</u>	58
1.3.3	The Experiential Aspect Marker <u>-guo</u>	61
1.3.4	Negation	62
1.3.5	Modal Verbs	65
1.4	VERB RESTRICTIONS OR THE 'DISPOSAL' NATURE OF <u>BEI</u> : A COUNTERARGUMENT	69
2	THE <u>BEI</u> PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS	82
2.1	THE AGENT AND THE EUROPEANIZED PASSIVE	82
2.1.1	The Agentless Europeanized <u>Bei</u> Passive	92
2.1.2	The Europeanized <u>Bei</u> Passive with a Collective Agent	92
2.2	THE TRADITIONAL ADVERSATIVE <u>BEI</u> PASSIVES	96
2.2.1	The Adversative <u>Bei</u> Passive with a Person as the Undergoer	97
2.2.2	The Adversative <u>Bei</u> Passive of Possessions	99
2.2.3	The Adversative <u>Bei</u> Passive with a Natural Force	103

	Page	
3	THE ADVERSATIVE <u>BEI</u> PASSIVE OF BODILY EFFECT	106
3.1	THE SYNTAX OF THE PASSIVE OF BODILY EFFECT	108
3.2	THE SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIATION OF THE PASSIVE OF BODILY EFFECT FROM THE REGULAR PASSIVE	120
3.3	THE SEMANTIC FIELD OF THE POSTVERBAL NOUN	127
3.3.1	Kinship	128
3.3.2	Material Possessions	134
	a. Clothes being worn on the body	134
	b. Other possessions	137
3.3.3	Name, Soul and Emotions	140
3.4	THE SEMANTIC NATURE OF THE EVENT ENCODED	148
3.4.1	Pleasant Events Affecting the Body	148
3.4.2	Good Health and Body Improvement	149
3.4.3	Neutral Events	151
3.5	SEMANTIC RESTRICTIONS ON THE DETERMINACY OF THE BODY PART TERM	154
3.6	THE SEMANTIC NATURE OF THE BODY PART TERM PERMISSIBLE	160
3.6.1	Parts of the Body versus Places or Areas on the Body	160
3.6.2	Internal Body Parts	163
4	THE <u>GET</u> PASSIVE IN ENGLISH	169
4.1	EARLIER ATTITUDES TO THE USE OF <u>GET</u>	171
4.2	TWO UNUSUAL KINDS OF PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION	172
4.3	OTHER ANALYSES OF THE <u>GET</u> PASSIVE	176
4.4	THE <u>GET</u> PASSIVE IN GENERAL	177
4.5	THE <u>GET</u> PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS	184
4.5.1	'Adversative' <u>Get</u> Passives with a Person as the Undergoer	184
	(i) The Non-Reflexive 'Adversative' <u>Get</u> <u>Get</u> Passive	184
	(ii) The Reflexive 'Adversative' <u>Get</u> Passive	189
4.5.2	'Beneficial' <u>Get</u> Passives with a Person as the Undergoer	194
	(i) The Non-Reflexive 'Beneficial' <u>Get</u> <u>Get</u> Passive	194
	(ii) The Reflexive 'Beneficial' <u>Get</u> Passive	198
4.5.3	<u>Get</u> Passives with an Inanimate Subject	200
	(i) The 'Adversative' <u>Get</u> Passive with an Inanimate Subject	200
	(ii) The 'Beneficial' <u>Get</u> Passive with an Inanimate Subject	202
	CONCLUSION TO PART I	207
II	<u>CAUSATIVE AND PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FORMED BY RANG AND JIAO</u>	
0	INTRODUCTION TO CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN CHINESE	211
0.1	ARE <u>RANG</u> AND <u>JIAO</u> CAUSATIVES SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS?	212

	Page
0.2 CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FORMED BY <u>SHI</u>	216
0.2.1 Comparison of <u>Shi</u> with <u>Rang</u> and <u>Jiao</u>	217
(i) Stative <u>Shi</u> Causative of Unintentional Causation	223
(ii) Stative <u>Shi</u> Causative of Agentless Causation	225
(iii) <u>Shi</u> Causative of Natural Phenomena	226
1 <u>RANG</u> CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS	229
1.1 <u>RANG</u> AS AN INDEPENDENT VERB	229
1.2 CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FORMED BY <u>RANG</u>	231
1.2.1 <u>Rang</u> Speech Act Causatives	232
(i) Speech Act Causative of Request with <u>Rang</u>	232
(ii) Speech Act Causative of Permission with <u>Rang</u>	238
1.2.2 <u>Rang</u> Causatives of Non-Interference	243
(i) <u>Rang</u> Causative of Non-Interference in an Agentive Event	248
(ii) <u>Rang</u> Causative of Non-Interference in an Agentless Event	250
1.2.3 <u>Rang</u> Experiencer Causatives	253
(i) Experiencer Causative of Unintentional Causation with <u>Rang</u>	253
(ii) Experiencer Causative of Agentless Causation with <u>Rang</u>	256
2 <u>JIAO</u> CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS	263
2.1 <u>JIAO</u> AS AN INDEPENDENT VERB	263
2.2 CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FORMED BY <u>JIAO</u>	264
2.2.1 <u>Jiao</u> Speech Act Causative	266
(i) Speech Act Causative of Command with <u>Jiao</u>	266
2.2.2 <u>Jiao</u> Experiencer Causatives	273
(i) Experiencer Causative of Unintentional Causation with <u>Jiao</u>	273
(ii) Experiencer Causative of Agentless Causation with <u>Jiao</u>	278
3 SYNTACTIC DIFFERENTIATION OF PASSIVE FROM CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FORMED BY <u>RANG</u> AND <u>JIAO</u>	283
3.1 ASPECTUAL MARKING AND SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS	285
3.1.1 Verbal Aspect Constructions with Completive <u>-le</u> , Experiential <u>-guo</u> and Durative <u>zhe</u>	285
3.1.2 No Aspectual Marking	290
3.1.3 Inchoative Sentential <u>le</u>	290
3.1.4 Perfect Constructions <u>-le...le</u> and <u>-guo...le</u>	291

	Page	
3.2	NEGATION	293
	3.2.1 Causative Verb Negation	294
	3.2.2 Main Verb Negation	297
3.3	MODAL VERBS	301
4	INTRODUCTION TO THE COLLOQUIAL PASSIVES IN CHINESE FORMED BY <u>RANG</u> AND <u>JIAO</u>	304
5	THE COLLOQUIAL <u>RANG</u> PASSIVES	309
5.1	THE <u>RANG</u> PASSIVES OF "AVOIDABLE EVENTS"	309
	(i) The <u>Rang</u> Passive of Avoidability with a Person as the Undergoer	316
	(ii) The <u>Rang</u> Passive of Avoidability on the Part of an Adversely Affected Owner	317
5.2	<u>RANG</u> VERSUS <u>BEI</u> : A SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIATION	321
6	THE COLLOQUIAL <u>JIAO</u> PASSIVES	329
6.1	THE <u>JIAO</u> PASSIVE OF "HOT NEWS"	329
6.2	THE SYNTACTIC DIFFERENTIATION OF THE <u>JIAO</u> PASSIVE FROM THE <u>RANG</u> AND <u>BEI</u> PASSIVES	330
6.3	THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIATION OF THE <u>JIAO</u> PASSIVE FROM THE <u>RANG</u> AND <u>BEI</u> PASSIVES	334
	CONCLUSION TO PART II	345
III <u>DATIVE AND BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FORMED BY GEI</u>		
0	INTRODUCTION TO PART III	349
1	THE DATIVE CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSFERRAL WITH ENCLITIC <u>GEI</u> : S <sub>1</sub>	361
1.1	SEMANTIC DESCRIPTION OF S <sub>1</sub>	363
	1.1.1 Presupposition of the Direct Object as being with the Subject	363
	1.1.2 Verb Classes in S <sub>1</sub>	364
	1.1.3 The Completiveness and Causativity of S <sub>1</sub> with respect to 'Causing to Have'	369
2	THE DATIVE CONSTRUCTION OF INTENDED BENEFIT WITH POSTVERBAL <u>GEI</u> : S <sub>2</sub>	372
2.1	SEMANTIC DESCRIPTION OF S <sub>2</sub>	373
	2.1.1 The Components of 'Usefulness' and 'Benefit'	373
	2.1.2 No Presupposition of the Direct Object as being with the Subject	378
	2.1.3 Verb Classes in S <sub>2</sub>	379
	2.1.4 Causativity versus Causative Intention: Causation of Having and Causation of Benefit	380

	Page
3 THE BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTION WITH PREVERBAL <u>GEI</u> : S <sub>3</sub>	391
3.1 COMPARISON OF THE BENEFACTIVE <u>GEI</u> CONSTRUCTION WITH THE <u>TI</u> AND <u>WEI</u> CONSTRUCTIONS	396
3.1.1 The <u>Ti</u> Construction of Social Obligation	412
3.1.2 The Symbolic <u>Wei</u> Construction	413
3.2 COMPARISON OF THE THREE <u>GEI</u> CONSTRUCTIONS	419
3.2.1 The Components for Presupposition of a Direct Object Compared	419
3.2.2 The Components for Causativity versus Causative Intention with respect to Causation of Having and Causation of Benefit Compared	422
CONCLUSION TO PART III	424
GENERAL CONCLUSION	426
SUMMARY OF CONSTRUCTIONS	432
BIBLIOGRAPHY	455



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my gratitude to Dr Anna Wierzbicka for her guidance and encouragement in the preparation of this work.

I would secondly like to thank my three main language informants: Yu Xiaohui from Harbin, North China; Fan Xiaodong from Beijing and Chang Chun-chi from Keelung, Taiwan.

The Arts Faculty of the Australian National University provided the funds for my field trip to China in 1980-81 for one year and the Commonwealth Department of Education; the postgraduate award which covered the three year period of my research. This project would not have been realized however without the solid backing and encouragement of Professor R.M.W. Dixon who also helped me in the critical reading of this thesis prior to its submission.

I am most grateful to Dr Tim Shopen for his enthusiastic discussion of ideas, reading of early drafts and interest in my work.

I would also like to thank Professor Michael Halliday for inviting me to take part in his Chinese-English Contrastive Linguistics course held at Sydney University in 1979 for his M.A. students from China. This provided a new source of ideas and information on both Chinese Linguistics and reference materials in Chinese at the outset of my research.

During my field trip to China, I stayed at Peking University where Professor Zhu De-xi of the Chinese Department acted as my supervisor. I would like to thank him for his comments, criticism and discussion of several draft chapters of my thesis. I am indebted to Dr Jocelyn Chey of the Australia-China Council for introducing me to Professor Zhu in 1980.

Professor Lu Jianming of the Chinese Department at Peking University should also be mentioned for his stimulating discussion of various grammatical problems in Chinese as part of the course he gave in Modern Chinese Grammar at Bei Da. This provided me with a wealth of data and thought-provoking ideas.

Finally I would like to thank Mrs Svetlana Byrne for her translation of two articles from the Russian by T.N. Nikitina (1958) and G.N. Rajskaja (1958), and Mr Constantin Kiriloff for his transcribing of the Chinese examples in these articles from the Cyrillic script back into Chinese ideographs.

## PRÉCIS

A semantic analysis of passive, causative and dative/benefactive constructions in Chinese is carried out in the following work.

In Part I, the view of the bei passive as an adversity passive in its traditional use is upheld and supported principally by the evidence of the synchronic semantic analysis and secondarily by other considerations such as its evolution from verb to grammatical exponent, its restricted usage when compared with the neutral topic-comment constructions and its function as a warning in the negative imperative mood.

The treatment of the bei passive as a polysemous structure results in its division into two main types - the traditional bei passive comprising four constructions and the 'Europeanised' literary bei passive where the influence of European languages in translation has led to the loss of the adversity feature and the modification of the semantic requirements pertaining to the agent with respect to its two constructions.

The analysis of the ge passive in English as forming a complex of constructions - some adversative and others beneficial in their overall interpretation - serves as the link between the discussion of adversity passives in Part I and the discussion of the purely colloquial passives formed by rang and jiao in Part II where parallels are drawn between the non-reflexive adversative ge passive and the rang passive.

In Part II, an argument in favour of considering the rang and jiao passives to be semantically distinct both from one another

and from the bei passive is presented. It is contended that rang forms passives of "avoidable events" whereas jiao forms passives expressing the unexpected nature of the event. The causative constructions formed by rang and jiao are also treated in Part II and shown to differ considerably in their syntactic behaviour from their respective passive constructions despite the sharing of the same syntactic form. Evidence is adduced to support the view that none of the jiao causatives express the meaning of 'let' or 'allow' whereas some of the rang causatives do. In this way, rang and jiao causatives are shown not to be interchangeable.

In Part III an argument is presented against the claim that the preverbal gei construction in Chinese is polysemous to the extent of being a benefactive construction that is mutually substitutable with the meanings of two other constructions formed by ti 'on behalf of' and wei 'for the sake of'. Secondly it is argued that the benefactive gei construction is not mutually transformable with either of the two dative constructions formed by gei as each of these three constructions not only has a unique syntactic form but consequently a unique semantic structure.

## EXPLANATORY NOTE ON THE USE OF THE TERM 'STANDARD CHINESE'

I use the term 'standard Chinese' as the translation of pǔtōnghuà (普通話) which means literally 'the common language' rather than the more old-fashioned term of 'Mandarin' that refers to the use of this language as the language of officialdom, guānhuà (官話), in imperial times.

In 1955, pǔtōnghuà or 'standard Chinese' was officially proclaimed as the new language norm in China as part of China's language reform policy. For this purpose, the Beijing dialect of northern Chinese, beīfānghuà (北方話), was selected as the model for the standard pronunciation of pǔtōnghuà while the corpus of modern works in vernacular Chinese was selected as the model for its grammar.<sup>1</sup> In general, pǔtōnghuà is loosely based on northern Chinese with the Beijing dialect acting as its prestige dialect.<sup>2</sup>

As two of my three main informants were educated through the medium of this standardized language, I will use 'standard Chinese' as the translation of pǔtōnghuà in preference to adopting the term 'Mandarin'.<sup>3</sup> Thus, in the text, wherever the abbreviation 'Chinese' occurs, it is intended to refer to pǔtōnghuà.

- 
1. See my article "The Romanization Debate" in The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs 4 (1980), 106-118; and Li and Thompson (1981: 1).
  2. See Paul Kratochvil, The Chinese Language Today, 1968, pp.19-22 for a discussion of the linguistic situation in China today.
  3. Kratochvil (1968) similarly translates pǔtōnghuà as 'Modern Standard Chinese'.

My third informant, Chang Chun-chi, is also a native speaker of northern Chinese (or Mandarin) which is, however, known as guóyǔ (國語) 'the national language' in Taiwan. It differs from pǔtōnghuà mainly in its use of lexical items. For the purposes of syntactic analysis here it will be considered not to vary significantly from the mainland form.

## LAYOUT OF LANGUAGE EXAMPLES

Transliteration of all the Chinese examples in the text is by means of pinyin, the transcription system for Chinese ideographic writing which is based on the Latin alphabet and was adopted in February 1958 by the National People's Congress of China.<sup>1</sup>

Each example is quoted in three parts:

- (a) Chinese text
- (b) morpheme-by-morpheme gloss
- (c) free English rendering

1. The morpheme-by-morpheme glosses ignore material not relevant to the discussion at hand such as indicating which morphemes are postpositions or which morpheme in a word is the classifier.

2. The use of the asterisk \* before examples means that the sentence is unacceptable for either semantic or grammatical reasons, this being indicated in the adjoining discussion.

3. (\*x) is used as in Li and Thompson (1981) to signify that the example would be unacceptable if it contained the indicated word or morpheme.

4. Nouns in standard Chinese have no distinction for number. In the morpheme-by-morpheme gloss, all nouns are glossed as singular, this being considered the unmarked form.

---

1. See my article on romanization (1980) for the reasons for selecting pinyin over other transcription systems.

Similarly, verbs do not inflect for the grammatical categories of person, number, tense or mood and these are glossed by the infinitive form in English minus the 'to'. Where neither aspectual marking nor time adverbs suggest an appropriate rendering of time reference for the English, the examples are generally translated by the past tense in English. This is an arbitrary decision, and the reader should bear in mind that a context that would be translated by the English present tense could just as easily be found.

5. As in Li and Thompson (1981), I have adopted the convention of using colons in glosses where more than one word is needed in English to gloss the Chinese morpheme or word, and also for Chinese compound verbs or verb + affix combinations whose constituents are separated by a hyphen in the Chinese transliteration. e.g.

- (i) jiejie  
older:sister
- (ii) na-zou  
take:away
- (iii) zuo-le  
do:COM

6. As there is no grammatical category of gender in Chinese nor pronominal distinction of this kind, the third person singular pronoun, ta, is glossed in alternate examples as either 'he' or 'she' and sometimes, where appropriate as 'it'. Throughout the English text, I also frequently resort to the otherwise colloquial use of the third person plural pronoun to substitute for the third person singular pronoun when used generically. This applies in all



of its case manifestations: They, them, their, theirs and <sup>themselves</sup> (for themselves) replace he, him, his and himself. In this way, the use of both the so-called generic 'he' and the unwieldy disjunction he/she or s/he is avoided. Although this may seem to be "incorrect usage" in some places, I find preferable to either of the latter solutions.

7. Implied meanings of the Chinese examples, necessary to the discussion in progress are enclosed in parentheses in the English translations.

8. Generally, no English translation is given for starred Chinese examples, apart from the morpheme-by-morpheme gloss. In some cases of unacceptable examples, however, the English meaning which I sought to encode by means of the particular Chinese construction is given in parentheses underneath.

9. Tones are indicated only for syllables that are typically stressed in conversational speech. (Unstressed syllables usually lose their full tonal value in Chinese.) Neither is tone sandhi indicated, syllables being given their tone values for citation forms, e.g. hěn hǎo would normally be pronounced as hén hǎo with the change of a third tone to a second when it precedes another third tone.

10. Except where otherwise indicated, all the translations of quotations from Chinese works and of Chinese examples are my own. This applies as well for two translations from the French of quotations from Bally (1925).

ABBREVIATIONS FOR THE GLOSSING OF  
GRAMMATICAL TERMS AND MORPHEMES

ADV	exponent forming adverbial phrase out of an adjective : <u>de</u>
AN	animate; N <sub>AN</sub> = noun denoting animate entity
BA	syntactic exponent of the <u>ba</u> construction
BEI	syntactic exponent of the <u>bei</u> construction
BOTH...AND	represents the syntactic construction <u>yibian...yibian</u> in Chinese (for the purposes of the English gloss only)
BP	body part N <sub>BP</sub> = noun denoting a body part
CAUS	causative verb
CL	noun or verb classifier
COM	completive aspect marker <u>-le</u> (used as a verbal suffix); or predicate that denotes a completive event
D.O.	direct object
DUR	durative aspect marker <u>-zhe</u> or <u>zai</u> (used preverbally)
EXP	experiential aspect marker <u>-guo</u> ; or predicate denoting an experiential event
EXT	verb complement of extent or state of affairs which uses <u>de</u> as its exponent
F	natural force; NP <sub>F</sub> = noun phrase denoting a natural force
GEN	exponent of a genitive noun phrase: <u>de</u>
IMP	imperative
IN	inanimate; N <sub>IN</sub> = noun denoting an inanimate entity
I.O.	indirect object
INC	sentential inceptive aspect marker <u>le</u> or inchoative aspect marker <u>-qilai</u> (verbal suffix)
INT	intensifier: verbal suffix <u>-si</u> or adverb <u>zhen</u> "really"
LE	completive aspect marker
LOC	NP <sub>LOC</sub> = noun phrase denoting a place or locale
NEG <sub>1</sub>	negative marker <u>bu</u>

NEG <sub>2</sub>	negative marker <u>mei</u> (you)
NOM	nominalizing construction formed by (shi)... <u>de</u>
NP	noun phrase
O	Object
P	pause particle; NP <sub>P</sub> = noun phrase denoting a person
POSS	possession; NP <sub>POSS</sub> = noun phrase denoting a possession
PL	plural morpheme <u>-men</u>
Q	question particle occurring sentence finally
REL	exponent forming a relative or adjectival clause: <u>de</u>
RP	rhetorical particle occurring sentence finally
sb	"somebody"
TENT	tentative aspect
V	verb; V <sub>TR</sub> = transitive verb
VP	verb phrase
V <sub>R</sub>	resultative verb compound

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The semantic analysis of passive, causative and dative/benefactive constructions in Chinese which is to be presented in the following chapters serves as an investigation into the inter-relationship of meaning and form, characterised by both cases of polysemy in syntax where the one syntactic configuration is used to grammaticalise several different meanings and by cases of the same morpheme being used to form different syntactic constructions with distinct grammatical meanings.

The passive constructions formed by bei in Chinese and the passive and causative constructions formed by both rang and jiao are examples of this first linguistic phenomenon, each kind of construction, whether it be passive or causative, comprising a number of discrete subconstructions in itself. The polysemy of the get passive in English provides another exemplification of the first phenomenon.

The use of gei 'give' to form benefactive and dative constructions in Chinese which are not only distinct in their semantic structures but also in their syntax represents the second type of linguistic phenomenon.

One implication of the following analysis is that no two different syntactic constructions are held to share the same grammaticalised meaning. Consequently, this analysis upholds the viewpoint that difference in form necessarily correlates with difference in meaning.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Dwight Bolinger's articles "Meaning and Form: Some Fallacies of Asemantic Grammar" (1975) and "Transitivity and Spatiality: The Passive of Prepositional Verbs" (1977) as well as his  
(cont.)

(i) Methodology:

A corollary of this viewpoint is that all syntactic constructions need to be explicated first of all in terms of their semantic structure. Hence this analysis is based on the belief that the study of semantics is fundamental and prior to the study of syntax. The ensuing analysis upholds such a belief implicitly in first investigating the underlying semantic features that surface in the particular syntactic forms and then explicitly in formulating the semantic representations for each construction.

The semantic features or properties postulated in the form of components for each semantic representation are consequently considered to be invariant features of the given constructions.

In the formal analysis, a small set of terms from natural language is used as a non-arbitrary semantic metalanguage. This set consists of both primitive concepts such as want, think of, say, become, I, you and be a part of<sup>2</sup> and near primitives such as do, happen, good, bad and because. In this way, the need for the invented symbols and markers of artificial metalanguages is eliminated.

This method is based upon the type of analysis advocated in the work of Anna Wierzbicka in the area of semantics of natural language and may be considered an application thereof. The method-

---

 1. (contd.)

monograph Meaning and Form (Longman: 1977) epitomise this viewpoint. He states in (1975: 7-8) that "in syntax, there is no such thing as two different surface structures with the same deep structure (that is, with the same meaning)..." and sets out to prove this to be the case.

2. See Wierzbicka (1972: 16) for the full set of semantic primitives and exegesis thereof.

ology used here is elaborated upon in her books Semantic Primitives (Athenäum: 1972) and Lingua Mentalis (Academic Press: 1980).<sup>3</sup>

The semantic metalanguage is applied systematically in the reductive paraphrase of each syntactic construction with each interpretation being subsequently formulated in the less complex but more readily comprehensible units of natural language, some of which were exemplified above.

The consistent use of simple concepts such as do and want in this type of formalization enables the semantic representations to be compared in a systematic way with one another to reveal any structural relationships which exist. This applies not only to related subconstructions belonging to each of the general constructions examined such as the passive constructions formed by bei, rang and jiao in Chinese and get in English but also between syntactic constructions of different types, for example, some of the passive and causative constructions formed by rang may thus be shown to be semantically related by virtue of both these rang constructions having one component that is similar (though not completely identical) in their semantic structures.

Secondly, these semantic representations in being explicit displays of the semantic structure are open to immediate verification on the part of speakers as opposed, for example, to the case of artificial metalanguages which need to be learnt before they can be applied or interpreted.

---

3. See also particularly her articles "Ethnosyntax and the philosophy of grammar" (1979a) and "Are grammatical categories vague or polysemous? The Japanese 'adversative' passive in a typological context" (1979b) for the methodology used in the semantic analysis of syntactic constructions.

Note that ad hoc terms such as 'adversative passive', 'permissive causative' and 'benefactive' construction are employed purely in the role of abbreviatory labels for the constructions examined. It is the semantic representations which serve as the most fully adequate means of explicating each particular component of meaning in a precise and exact manner. At best, informal terms are only able to vaguely allude to these features. Therefore, it is also claimed that only the semantic representations can accurately predict all acceptable examples of each construction.

This analytic procedure constitutes one step towards an ultimate explication of the meaning of each grammatical construction to be examined that would be entirely formulated in terms of a small set of semantic indefinables hypothesized to exist in every language.<sup>4</sup>

Although the formulation of the semantic structure of each grammatical construction under investigation here is the ultimate goal of my analysis, this is not to say that syntactic features are overlooked. As Bolinger aptly puts it: "grammatical restrictions flow as corollaries" from meaning (1975: 16). Several chapters deal specifically with the syntactic behaviour of the several different types of constructions.

(ii) Resumé of Contents.

In the following analysis, three major kinds of syntactic constructions are examined: These are the passive, causative and

---

4. See Introduction in Wierzbicka (1972) and the one in Wierzbicka (1980) for a full explanation.

dative/benefactive constructions in Chinese. The analysis is carried out, moreover, with reference to the analogous syntactic constructions in English although these, in the main part, do not undergo any exhaustive treatment here except in the case of the get passive in English which due to its being regarded as a colloquial passive has generally been overlooked by researchers in much the same way as the rang passive has - its Chinese counterpart. These two complexes of constructions are compared in Part II.

In Part I, the passive construction formed by bei is examined in detail with reference to many points of interest in other analyses of this 'adversative' passive. It is contended that for the general form of the bei passive, the semantic properties of adversity, completiveness, the identifiable nature of the subject/undergoer and the obligatory expression of the agent are inherent features. After the discussion of the general form is completed, I attempt to account for the polysemy of the bei passive by justifying the postulation of six discrete subconstructions which while sharing these general semantic components display in addition subtle semantic differences. Finally, the non-traditional Europeanized form of the bei passive is examined and found to comprise two subconstructions of the agentless and agentful types. Furthermore, for these two subconstructions, the component of adversity has been completely neutralized.

Part I ends with two in-depth analyses of two different types of passive constructions, the first one being the bei passive of bodily effect and the second, the get passive in English. The analysis of the colloquial get passive acts as a bridge between the discussion of the bei passive, a passive construction which belongs



to a more formal speech register in Chinese and the analyses of the two colloquial passives carried out in Part II where the polysemy of syntactic constructions formed by rang and jiao is specifically investigated. This analysis is related to Part I by the fact that rang and jiao both form passive constructions, though be it of a colloquial nature and distinguished from Part I by the fact that both these exponents of the passive also form periphrastic causative constructions which exhibit apparently identical syntactic form and behaviour to their passive counterparts.

The task of the analysis here then is not only to differentiate the rang and jiao passives from the bei passive but also to differentiate the rang and jiao passives respectively from their causative counterparts. This differentiation is carried out from both semantic and syntactic angles after a brief look at the complex of shi causative constructions in the introductory chapter. The latter in being largely restricted to use in the literary domain is not given any in-depth treatment. Moreover, shi is not used to form any passive constructions.

In this part, the rang passive is likened to the non-reflexive adversative get passive in English. Both may be regarded as passives of avoidability, specifically, passive constructions which encode that the subject/undergoer could have avoided or prevented the passive event.

In Part I and Part II, it becomes evident that all the passive constructions in Chinese are adversative in nature. - No beneficial passives such as the duoc passive in Vietnamese are to be found.

The predisposition of analytic passives in Chinese to express misfortune having been established, in Part III we turn to constructions expressing benefit and examine the use of the verb gei 'give' as a syntactic exponent to form benefactive and dative constructions in Chinese. Although gei also forms an adversative passive, it is not examined in depth in this analysis due to its being a purely dialectal as opposed to standard form.

These constructions, in contradistinction to those formed by bei, rang and jiao in Chinese and get in English are not polysemous in nature apart from the construction where gei occurs preverbally, a syntactic form shared by both the gei passive and gei benefactive construction. On this point I take issue with claims to the contrary that preverbal gei is three-ways polysemous to the extent that two of its meanings are identical to those of two other syntactically distinct but supposedly benefactive constructions formed by ti and wei.

Moreover I argue in Part III against any transformational relation holding between the two dative and one benefactive construction and justify this viewpoint by showing that even though the three constructions share the one syntactic exponent - gei - not only is their syntactic structure different but their semantic structures are also distinct.

Thus, Part I and Part II constitute studies of polysemy in syntax while Part III constitutes a study of syntactic constructions that are different in form and by consequence, different in grammaticalised meaning, regardless of the fact that they are all formed by gei.

PART I

THE TRADITIONAL ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVE

0. INTRODUCTION TO PART I

Adversity passives, in particular the bei passive in Chinese are the topic of analysis in Part I. In general, the investigation into the polysemy of the bei passive in Chinese results in the division of the general bei passive structure into two main types, these being the 'traditional adversative bei passive' and the bei passive which due to the impact of European languages in translation has undergone certain modifications to its semantic structure. The second type is called the 'Europeanized' passive in this analysis to distinguish it from the traditional bei passive throughout the discussion. The Europeanized bei passive is confined to the literary sphere as opposed to the traditional bei passive which is used in both vernacular and written Chinese.

Secondarily, the polysemy of the ge passive in English is examined due to the fact that the adversity feature is present in some of its constructions and for the purposes of comparison with the rang passive treated in Part II. As the final chapter of Part I, it serves as a link with the following analyses of the rang and jiao passive and causative constructions as in its analysis some of the semantic properties of the rang passive in particular are foreshadowed.

In the introduction to Part I, the view is put forward that the motivation for the use of an analytic passive construction in Chinese is the encoding of adversity. Otherwise, the neutral topic-comment constructions are preferred to the use of the bei passive as they are not only able to encode the semantic undergoer as the subject, but do so without recourse to any special syntactic

or morphological exponent and without the concomitant expression of adversity.

A brief description of the historical development of the verb bei to come to be used as the syntactic exponent of an adversity passive precedes the discussion of the general semantic properties of the traditional bei passive in Chapter 2: the adverse state of affairs which comes about for the undergoer; the "identifiability" of the subject and the completive nature of the predicate in the passive.

In Section 1.1, a semantic analysis supporting the postulation of the feature of adversity is carried out, followed by an evaluation of two other methods of analysis that have been applied to the bei passive - the verb classification method and the Case Grammar approach. The fact that the bei passive serves as a warning when used in the negative imperative mood is used as further evidence to support the claim that it is intrinsically adversative.

A necessary preliminary to the discussion of the completive nature of the passive predicate in Section 1.3 is the description of the semantic characteristics of the subject given in Section 1.2 and the definition of the notion of "identifiability".

In Section 1.3, aspectual marking, negation and modal verbs are investigated in order to determine which are compatible with the bei passive and it is shown that only those which do not violate the encoding of a completed event can co-occur with it.

An argument against the analysis of bei only in terms of co-occurring verbs is presented in Section 1.4. Here it is pointed out that the characterisation of the type of verb to be found in the bei passive as either 'transitive' or 'disposal' in nature is inadequate in terms of accounting for all the data. It is proposed instead that a subtler semantic characterisation in terms of whether

or not an event can be understood as directly affecting the undergoer can account for all the data in combination with the other components of the semantic formula. This includes counterexamples to the 'transitive' or 'disposal' verb hypothesis which contain verbs of happening and verbs of emotion.

This discussion concludes the analysis of the semantic properties of the general bei passive and leads into Chapter 2 where the semantic structures of the six separate constructions belonging to the bei passive - four adversative and two Europeanized - are postulated and their components justified. These are the

#### ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVES

- (i) Adversative Bei Passive with a Person as the Undergoer
- (ii) Adversative Bei Passive of Possessions
- (iii) Adversative Bei Passive with a Natural Force
- (iv) Adversative Bei Passive of Bodily Effect

#### EUROPEANIZED BEI PASSIVES

- (i) Agentless Europeanized Bei Passive
- (ii) Europeanized Bei Passive with a Collective Agent

First of all, the argument supporting the division of the bei passive into the two main types - adversative and Europeanized - is put forward in Section 2.1. I claim that the traditional bei passive still encodes the semantic features of adversity and overt expression of the agent as opposed to the Europeanized passive where these features have either been lost or modified. The Europeanized passive is then further subdivided into an agentless construction and one requiring a collective agent.

Three of the four adversative bei passives are treated in Section 2.2 where their semantic formulae are proposed and components of meaning contained therein are justified.

The fourth adversative bei passive - the passive of bodily effect - is singled out for an in-depth analysis of its semantic components, presented in Chapter 3, due to its special syntactic configuration with a postverbal noun. Comparison is made here with constructions in four other languages - French, German, Italian and Polish - which also express an inalienable relationship between part and whole.

Finally, in Chapter 4, the analysis of the polysemy of the get passive in English is presented. The polarisation of the get passive into events which express adversity and events which express benefit or good fortune for the subject and undergoer is a major feature of this description.

The general syntactic structure of the adversative bei passive under examination in the following pages takes this form:

SUBJECT NOUN PHRASE	BEI	AGENT NOUN PHRASE	VERB PHRASE
(Undergoer)			
<u>Mali</u>	<u>bei</u>	<u>tufei</u>	<u>kun-qilai-le.</u>
(name)	BEI	bandits	tie:up : COM

Mary was tied up by the bandits.

It will be pointed out in the course of the presentation which semantic and syntactic features are shared with the two colloquial passives formed by rang and jiao; these constructions being the subject of Part II.

0.1 THE MOTIVATION FOR THE USE OF THE PASSIVE IN CHINESE

There must be a definite motivation for using the bei construction, otherwise it's better to use a ba construction or a middle voice one. Even if we want to use the undergoer as the subject, we don't have to use bei ...

-Lǐ Shuxiang (1965:291)

In Theory of Chinese Grammar, Wang Li examines the applicability to Chinese of the five reasons given by Jespersen in Essentials of English Grammar for the choice of the "passive turn" in English.<sup>1</sup> Three of the five reasons prove to be inapplicable to Chinese, this being the case for the first two that Jespersen lists, presented below:

- (1) The active subject (what would be the active subject if we had chosen the active turn) cannot be easily stated:

Her father was killed in the Boer War.

- (2) The active subject is self-evident from the context:

He was elected Member of Parliament for Leeds.

Here, an active form topic-comment construction would be used in Chinese:

1. Wenti taolun qingchu - le.  
problem discuss clear : COM

The problem has been clarified through discussion.

Neither is Jespersen's third reason applicable to Chinese:

- (3) There may be a special reason (tact or delicacy of sentiment) for not mentioning the active subject; thus the mention of the first person is avoided, in writing more frequently than in speaking.

1. Wang Li, Zhongguo Yufa Lilun (1944), I, pp. 178-181.

Otto Jespersen, Essentials of English Grammar (1913), pp.120-1.



In this case, a subjectless active sentence would be used in Chinese. Consider the opening sentence taken from an article in a linguistics periodical:

2. Ba "gei" zi fenxi-cheng dongci jian jieci, keyi  
BA 'give' word analyse: as verb and preposition, can  
bijiao jiandan de jieshi xuduo jufa xianxiang  
quite simply adv explain many syntactic phenomena  
If (we) analyse GEI as both a verb and preposition, (we)  
can quite simply explain many syntactic phenomena. <sup>2</sup>

Only the last two of Jespersen's conditions are considered by Wang Li to be relevant to the Chinese situation. This concerns cases where the agent, which Jespersen refers to as the "converted subject", is explicitly mentioned:

- (4) Where it is indicated ("converted subject") the reason why the passive turn is preferred is generally the greater interest taken in the passive than in the active subject.
- (5) Or the passive turn may facilitate the connexion of one sentence with another:

He rose to speak, and was listened to with enthusiasm by the great crowd present.

I think that the last two conditions may be considered different facets of the same component of meaning that is being expressed in both English and Chinese passives regardless of whether the agent is mentioned or not: "I want to say something about person A (the undergoer), not because I want to say something about anything else"<sup>3</sup>. This is part of the illocutionary force,

- 
2. Zhu Dexi, "Syntactic Problems Associated with the Verb GEI", Fangyan, No.2 (1979), p.81.
3. Anna Wierzbicka, The Case for Surface Case, Linguistica Extranea, Studia 9 (Ann Arbor: Karoma, 1980), p.66.

so to speak, of passives. If reference to an agent is made, as in agentful passive constructions, then this is in order to say something more about the undergoer: "I say something about person B (the agent) because I want to say something about person A (the undergoer)." The subordinate role of the agent has been clearly defined in A. Wierzbicka's "Case for Surface Case" (1980:65) in this way: "... in a 'full' passive the speaker ... 'uses' the agent as an instrument of saying something about the patient ..."

As a consequence of adopting the above standpoint, I disagree with Jespersen's first two reasons as being primary motivations for the use of the passive in English (where the agent is either unknown or self-evident from the context). Rather, it is simply a case of the agent not being the main topic, the primary interest being focussed on the undergoer, as the formalization above shows.

In English, the be and get passives may or may not have the agent expressed, that is, we have both agentful and agentless constructions. In Chinese, however, the agent is always expressed in the non-Europeanized and colloquial form of the bei passive (q.v. Chapter 2). Hence, this is one reason why the agentless English passive is not likely to be translated into Chinese by the bei passive. Secondly, passive constructions in Chinese are more restricted and marked in usage than they are in English due to a larger number of semantic constraints affecting them, as will be revealed in the following analysis. Wang Li was one of the first linguists to point out that while it may be possible to transform most active sentences in English into the be passive this is not the case for the bei passive in Chinese (1944:181):

In Chinese ... the application of the passive is much narrower than that of the active. Many active sentences may not be freely changed into the passive. For example: ...

Wo du Hong Lou Meng. [I am reading "Dream of the Red Chamber"] cannot be changed into Hong Lou Meng bei wo du. ["Dream of the Red Chamber" was read by me.] 4

It is a well-known fact that Chinese has little inflectional morphology.<sup>5</sup> Unlike most Indo-European languages, there is no requirement for the congruence of subject and verb in the sentence, indicated by inflection of the verb for person and number. A comparison of the conjugation of the French verb avoir 'have' in the present tense with its Chinese counterpart yǒu shows this to be the case. The Chinese verb form remains invariant:

<u>FRENCH</u>	<u>CHINESE</u>	<u>ENGLISH</u>
J' ai	Wǒ yǒu	I have
Tu as	nǐ yǒu	you have
il a	tā yǒu	he has
nous avons	wǒmen yǒu	we have
vous avez	nǐmen yǒu	you have
ils ont	tāmen yǒu	they have

In this respect, English has rather a vestigial morphological system compared to other Indo-European languages. Despite this however, English grammar exhibits a high correlation

---

4. Wang Liao Yi, Hanyu Yufa Gangyao, (Shanghai: Xin Zhishi, 1957), p.110. (n.b. "Wang Liao Yi" is a nom de plume for Wang Li.)

5. See, for example, Yuen Ren Chao, A Grammar of Spoken Chinese, (Berkeley: Univ. California, 1968), p.198.

Charles N. Li & Sandra A. Thompson, Mandarin Chinese, (Berkeley: Univ. California, 1981), p.11.

between its grammatical and semantic roles with respect to the syntactic subject: The subject of a majority of active sentences is typically the semantic agent and, apart from cases of ellipsis and some styles of answering, the subject and its verb are both obligatory constituents of the sentence. In contrast to this, the subject of a syntactic construction in "active form" in Chinese is as likely to be the semantic undergoer as the agent. It is more accurately described as the sentential topic than as the subject understanding "subject" in the grammatical sense of governing agreement with the verb.

In fact, the lack of this stringent condition requiring subject-verb agreement which makes Chinese seem to be "freer" in its syntax, enables passive-like expressions to be encoded in active form. This is known as the "Topic-Comment" construction or the "passive without bei".<sup>6</sup>

Yuen Ren Chao espouses the viewpoint of the subject-predicate distinction not providing the optimal method of analysis for Chinese grammar. He considers that the crucial distinction to be made at sentence level in Chinese grammar is that of topic and comment, treating the Chinese sentence unit as being made up of two smaller sentences with these respective functions. (1968:183).

The loose structure of sentences in topic-comment form is evident from the ease with which pause particles may be inserted

---

6. Chao, Grammar, p.69ff., and Li & Thompson, (1976:459) call it "topic-comment"; Wang Liaoyi, Gangyao, p.112, Guo Derun (1981:37) and Hong Xinheng (1956:26) call it "the passive without bei" among others.

after the topic as opposed to any other constituent, for example the pause particle a:

3a.        Zhang San a, wo yidianr bu xihuan.  
           (name) RP I one:bit not like  
           As for Zhang San, I don't like him one bit.

3b.        \*Zhang San wo a yidianr bu xihuan.  
           (name) I RP one:bit not like

This syntactic property lends weight to the treatment of the topic-comment construction as being composed of two minor sentences.

The basic topic-comment construction has this form:

I	NOUN PHRASE	VERB PHRASE
	(undergoer)	(action verb)
	Topic	Comment

3.        Mian'ao dou mai-guang - le.  
           jacket all sell:bare : COM  
           The padded jackets have all been sold out.

4.        Shu kan-wan - le  
           book read:finish : COM  
           As for the book, (I've) finished reading it.

Furthermore, an agent may be readily assimilated into this construction as part of the comment, the undergoer remaining in its function as the sentential topic. This constitutes a second kind of topic-comment construction and it has the syntactic form:

II	NOUN PHRASE	NOUN PHRASE	VERB PHRASE
	(undergoer)	(agent)	(action verb)
	Topic	Comment	

5.        Zhaotie wo yijing tie-shang - le.  
notice    I    already paste:up : COM

As for the notices, I've already pasted them up.

6.        Yu ta bu chi.  
fish he not eat

"Fish isn't eaten by him."

Hence, agentless be passives with inanimate subjects are most likely to be translated into Chinese by the first kind of topic-comment construction exemplified by (3) and (4), and agentful be passives by the second topic-comment construction unless the latter meet certain other special conditions of the bei passive.

The topic-comment construction in Chinese, under which several different semantic structures are subsumed, pre-empts the need for a passive construction like the be passive in English, the latter also being regarded as a syntactic means of topicalizing the semantic undergoer in this analysis.

Looking at this feature conversely, Loh Dian-yang observes that in English a [grammatical] subject is necessary and hence the extensive use of the passive form, whereas the Chinese active verbs, not needing a [grammatical] subject, allow agentless active sentences

to be used, exemplified by (2) above, (1959: II, pp.66-7).<sup>7</sup>

- 
7.        The term "subject" is used in this thesis in Hockett's sense of "the person or thing about which something is said". I prefer the use of "subject" to "topic" in that "topic" refers only to the semantic or pragmatic functions of the given NP within the sentence whereas "subject" also refers to the role of this NP as syntactic pivot - occurring in first position of an NP in the sentence. In Chinese, as there is no subject-verb congruence, the syntactic pivot cannot be described as the grammatical subject. See Li and Thompson (1976) for a discussion of subject and topic in Chinese.

Wang Li also claims more specifically that this active-form "passive without bei" is preferable when the subject is inanimate (1944, I, p.178). Indeed, if the topic is animate and non-human there may be ambiguity, out of context:

7.        Ji        chi - le.  
          chicken eat : COM
- 1) The chicken has been eaten  
2) The chicken has eaten.

However, if the topic is a person, then the construction may only have an agentive reading:

8.        Wo    da    - le    yi-dun.  
          I    hit    : COM    one:CL
- 1) I gave (somebody) a beating up.  
2) \*I was beaten up.

In other words, only non-human animate NPs as the topic may be a source of potential ambiguity. Inanimate NPs as the topic are understood as the undergoer and personal NPs as the agent. However, when we have two noun phrases designating persons as in the second topic-comment construction, the topic denotes a separate entity from the agent and is in this case, understood to be the undergoer:

9.        Didi    wo    da    - le    yi-dun.  
          younger: I    hit : COM    one:CL  
          brother

As for my (younger) brother, I gave him a beating.

As I have pointed out, the latter must be considered a different construction to the former.

The lack of any morphological change when predicates or sentences act as the topic gives further evidence of the reliance on

syntax in Chinese rather than morphology to signify grammatical relations:

10.        Da taijiquan            hen you haochu.  
          play shadow:boxing    very have advantage  
  
          Doing shadow boxing is very good for you.
11.        Ni bu qu    biao ming    ni dui    ta bu zhichi.  
          you not go    show            you to    him not support  
  
          Your not going means you don't support him.

The V-0 predicate structure in (10) and the sentential structure in (11) acting as topics may be used as independent sentences without any change in form:

12.        Da    taijiquan!  
          play    shadow:boxing  
  
          Take up shadow boxing!
13.        Ni bu qu.  
          you not go  
  
          You're not going.

In English, the infinitive form of the verb or its gerund must be used when the predicates or sentences are used as subjects (viz. "To do shadow boxing" or "Doing shadow boxing ...") in place of the (subject and) finite verb in the independent sentences.

This section has shown that there are other grammatical strategies available to encode passive-like expressions or more accurately, ones which make the semantic undergoer the sentential topic, with the topic-comment construction being singled out as serving this function.



Moreover, it is generally agreed that the topic-comment construction is the usual means of topicalizing undergoers and not the syntactically marked passive with bei. For example, Wang Huan considers sentences which do not use bei to express the passive to be the more prevalent<sup>8</sup> and this viewpoint is shared by Loh Dian-yang who remarks that the syntactic passive is limited in Chinese, notional passives being used in most cases (1959:II,68).

If the topic-comment construction is the more common and thus the less semantically restricted topicalization strategy in Chinese, when are the syntactically marked passive constructions used such as the bei passive and what semantic purpose do they fulfill?

After a brief look at the historical development of the bei passive that is semantically relevant to the discussion of its modern day usage, I will put forward the viewpoint that the bei passive expresses an additional semantic component over and above that of wanting to say something primarily about the undergoer of an event. It also expresses the unfortunate nature of the event for the undergoer. This is the feature which accounts for its more restricted usage.

---

8. Wang Huan, 'Ba' Zi Ju he 'Bei' Zi Ju (Shanghai, Xin Zhishi, 1957), p.46.

0.2 A NOTE ON THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PASSIVE:

In Archaic Chinese (the period up to the 3rd century A.D.),<sup>9</sup> bei was used as a full verb with a meaning similar to that of 'receive' but in the sense of 'suffer'.<sup>10</sup> Here are two examples from the Shi Ji (The Historical Records) of the Han dynasty (206 BC - 220 AD) compiled around 109-91 BC which illustrate this verbal use of bei. In both cases, it will be seen that bei is followed by a nominal and the construction has the form NP + BEI + NP:

14. Gao zu bei jiu.  
emperor "suffer:from" wine  
"The Emperor was drunk"

15. Shen bei shu shi chuang.  
body "suffer:from" several ten wound  
"(His) body received many wounds."

At this early stage in the development of the bei passive, an agent phrase was not permitted and it was only at the beginning of the Middle Archaic period (4th-12th centuries A.D.) that it began to appear.<sup>11</sup> In fact, it became a very common "alternative" form of the passive during the Six Dynasties period (222-589 A.D.) as exemplified in the Shi Shuo Xin Yu (New Anecdotes of Social Talk) of the 5th century A.D.:

---

9. Wang Li, Hanyu Shigao (1980) I, p.35. The different periods of Classical Chinese mentioned in this section follow Wang Li's classification.

10. P. Bennett in "The Evolution of Passive and Disposal Sentences" (JCL, No.9, 1981) points out that "to suffer from" is often a more accurate gloss than "to receive". Footnote 6, p.87. [Examples (14) and (16) are from his article and example (15) from Liu Shiru (1956).]

11. Ibid., p.76. See also Wang Li, Hanyu Shigao, II, pp.425-426.

16.        Liangzi bei Su Jun hai.  
          (name) suffer (name) harm  
          "Liangzi was harmed by Su Jun."

The insertion of the agent phrase into the bei passive was a development contingent upon the interpretation of the final element in the construction as a verb, and no longer as a nominal as in the first two examples.<sup>12</sup> Such an interpretation was of course facilitated by the fact that parts of speech were not morphologically distinct, which remains largely the case in Modern Chinese.<sup>13</sup> The implication for the morpheme bei was that its grammatical function was consequently reinterpreted as being the syntactic exponent of the passive and no longer as a full verb.

From the semantic aspect Wang Li differs from Bennett (1981) in holding the viewpoint that the verb bei had two distinct meanings - both 'cover' and 'suffer', and that it was from the latter meaning that bei evolved from its verbal use to its grammatical use in the passive construction. Both meanings of 'cover' and 'suffer' furthermore, stem from an even earlier use of bei to mean 'put on the body'.<sup>14</sup>

That one of the meanings of the verb bei in Archaic Chinese was 'suffer' or 'suffer from' is highly pertinent to a synchronic semantic analysis of the bei passive in Modern Chinese

- 
12. Two linguists who have put forward this kind of analysis of the development of the bei passive are Liu Shiru in "The Origins of the Passive Form" (YWXX, 1956, No.8) and Paul Bennett, op.cit.
13. See Chao (1968:183).
14. Wang Li, (1980), II, p.420. Also stated in "The Development of the Passive in Chinese", in Yuyanxue Luncong, ed. Wang Li, 1957, p.10. Gao Mingkai (1957:207) similarly claims that bei had the meaning of 'cover' as a verb.

such as the one that will be presented below, especially as the characterization of this construction as an adversative passive will be maintained, a viewpoint which has remained the subject of much debate in this area of Chinese linguistics. As Wang Li remarks: "a newly arisen grammatical construction only adopts a lexical form that is mutually appropriate for its expression."<sup>15</sup>

---

15. Wang Li, (1980), II, p.430.

1 THE SEMANTIC AND SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF THE BEI PASSIVE IN GENERAL

1.1 ADVERSITY

The passive form must describe an unfortunate or unexpected event.

- Wang Li (1944:181)

1.1.1 Other Treatments of the Question of Adversity

The traditional view of the bei passive is that it is an adversative passive. In 1953, the Linguistics Institute of the Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing published a short article in the periodical Chinese Language paraphrasing the semantic structure of the bei passive in this way, though be it imprecise:

Bei expresses the phenomenon of suffering ... According to traditional usage, the bei construction mainly explains that there has been suffering for the subject; naturally the suffering is not of one's own free will, and as a result, it can only express that there has been harm or unhappiness and unwillingness - this kind of behaviour.

17

In the following discussion of the bei passive, not only will a much more precise representation of the semantics of the bei passive be proposed but it will also be contended that the typical analysis of the bei passive as being only one construction should be refined to the postulation of a general form which comprises several different constructions, determined by structural differences such as the kinds of nouns filling the roles of agent and undergoer.

To use such descriptive words as 'suffering', 'harm', 'unwillingness' or 'unhappiness' for one of the semantic features of

---

17. Zhongguo Kexueyuan Yuyan Yanjiusuo Yufa Xiaozu, "Zhudongci", Zhongguo Yuwen, 9, No.26 (1953), 29-30. (Hereafter known as Yuyan Yanjiusuo.)

the bei passive is vague and imprecise at best in terms of these words serving as the tools of semantic analysis. In formulating semantic representations it is important to avoid using complex terms such as these and consequently the tautologies of definition which result: For example, if the passive event in question is characterized as both "unfortunate" and causing "suffering" to the undergoer, economy and conciseness of definition have been relinquished in that both terms could have been defined more simply in terms of a person "not wanting" the event to happen.

Hence, one objective of this analysis is to show that the bei passive is not both an 'unfortunate and unexpected' event as defined by Wang Li, but only an "unfortunate" one. Thereby, the semantic representation can be disencumbered of an unwanted and superfluous disjunction. Finally, it should be noted that for the sake of brevity, the term 'adversity' will be used consistently throughout the analysis to contrast the bei passive with other constructions which are neutral and "non-subjective" as far as this semantic feature is concerned. I emphasise that this is merely for the purpose of informal semantic description and does not in any way serve as a substitute for the semantic representation where the adverse state of affairs for the undergoer is explicated in less complex terms as an event which was 'bad' for the undergoer.

The adversative nature of the bei passive is in fact its most debated feature. The majority of linguists who have written specifically on this topic claim that the traditional usage of this passive was as an adversative passive, and purely so. Nonetheless, their argument proceeds to the effect that this 'semantic colouring' has been lost or diluted due to the influence of European languages on Chinese with the influx of translated works which began early

this century.<sup>18</sup> It is common to find such

---

18. The 18 references listed below deal with this feature of the bei passive in some depth, most sharing the view given above:

- (1) Y.R. Chao, (1968), p.703.
- (2) C. Chu, (1973), pp.449-50.
- (3) Guo Derun, (1981), p.30.
- (4) C. Li and S. Thompson, (1981), p.493, p.496.
- (5) Li Linding, (1980), p.411.
- (6) Liang Donghan, (1960), pp.63-6.
- (7) Liu Shiru, (1956), p.33.
- (8) Loh Dian-yang, (1959), I, p.131; II, p.67.
- (9) Lu Shuxiang and Zhu Dexi, (1952), p.87.
- (10) G.N. Rajskaja, (1958), p.225.
- (11) Wang Huan, (1957), p.43; p.56.
- (12) Wang Li, (1944), I, p.181.
- (13) Wang Li, (1947), I, p.173.
- (14) Wang Li, (1957), I, p.15.
- (15) Wang Li, (1980), II, p.432; p.435.
- (16) Wang Liaoyi, (1957), p.111.
- (17) Zhang Zhigong, (1957), p.92.
- (18) Zhongguokexueyuan Yuyansuo, (1953), p.30.

Of the 18 in-depth studies of the bei passive consulted, 15 uphold the standpoint that bei traditionally expressed adversity, before it was 'eroded' by the influence of various European languages in translation. Only three analyses oppose it, setting up various counterarguments. These are Liang (1960), Liu (1956) and Chu (1973).

There are also many other analyses of the bei passive which do not treat this particular feature specifically. These are listed in the bibliography.

It also needs to be pointed out that Wang Li is responsible for five of 15 works included in the "pro" category and indeed he seems to be the earliest proponent of this standpoint, the remaining ten works (articles or grammars) following suit, many of them making reference to Wang Li's writings.

Liang Donghan (1960) and Liu Shiru (1956) take issue with Wang Li's claim and counterargue, particularly Liang, that even in the traditional usage of the passive, exemplified by the vernacular novel Hong Lou Meng [Dream of the Red Chamber] of the 18th century, examples of bei expressing neutral and fortunate events are to be found.

Chu (1973) begins by qualifying the generally accepted standpoint but ends up rejecting it overall, claiming that pleasant events can be incorporated into the passive provided that the Benefactive case is not required in doing so (p.460).

(contd)

statements as this one by Wang Huan:

In colloquial speech before the May 4th Movement [1919], bei sentences which described unhappy or unfortunate events were definitely in the majority ... Modern Chinese has been influenced by the literature of foreign languages so that bei sentences which do not describe unhappy events have increased. (1957:p.43, p.45)

This relegates the adversative status of the bei passive to the limbo land of "might-be's".

Wang Li makes the much stronger claim that this development has only taken place in the written language, whereas colloquially the restriction to unfortunate or unhappy events still prevails (1957:15). Lu and Zhu (1952:87) and Guo Derun (1981:30) all echo this view. The literary - colloquial distinction is crucial to the following analysis and is elaborated upon in section 2.1 which deals with the "Europeanized" bei passive.

Let us briefly digress upon the usage of the bei passive: It is generally considered to be a feature of literary Chinese rather than of colloquial speech, where the passives formed by jiao, rang and gei (treated below) are the preferred constructions.<sup>19</sup> However, bei is used colloquially too.

---

18. (contd)

Another eminent linguist, Gao Mingkai takes the rather unusual position of claiming that there is no passive form in Chinese, all verbs being "middle voice" since they do not need a subject (v. Hanyu Yufa Lun, Kexue, 1957, p.202).

19. Several Linguists share this view, e.g., Lu Shuxiang (1981:268, 405), Wang Huan (1957:33), Wang Liaoyi (1957:112), Liang Donghan (1960:75), Guo Derun (1981:30) and Zhang Zhigong (1957:92).

Liang Donghan in particular claims that only the bei ... suo construction is exclusively literary, and that bei is found colloquially even though it's not as popular as jiao, rang and gei.



Although the bei passive may not be typical of most varieties of colloquial speech, it is on the other hand freely used by that section of the populace which has had access to higher education: academics, university students and intellectuals. Thus apart from its use in the more formal register of news broadcasting, the educated elite in China use it colloquially and it is considered to serve as a sign of their education.<sup>20</sup>

### 1.1.2 Semantic Analysis

The evidence for considering the bei passive to be a passive of adversity is now presented: The traditional bei passive always expresses an unfortunate state of affairs for the subject, when referring to a person. To demonstrate this, we should address ourselves to the question of whether or not predicates of good fortune as well as those neutral with respect to this feature can occur in the passive. As we have seen there have been many conflicting views on this point. In fact, a semantic transformation takes place upon the use of such predicates: When predicates of good fortune are combined with the bei passive, the newly arisen state of affairs comes to be interpreted as an unfortunate one for the subject-undergoer. Take for example, the passive event which is

---

20. This was the linguistic situation as I found it during my field trip to China in 1980-81 when I stayed at Peking University. My main informants and teachers at the university agreed that bei was used in university circles as a sign of learnedness and thus of the social status attached to it and that it wasn't likely to be heard in peasant or worker milieus. As a result, I was readily able to find informants who had intuitions about the use of this construction. This was important for ascertaining the unique semantic features of the bei passive as opposed to those of the other colloquial passives, since these informants used the whole range of passive constructions as opposed to most people who would only use the purely colloquial passives formed by jiao, rang and gei.

expressed using the verb biaoyang 'praise':

17.        Wo zuotian bei laoshi hao-haor de biaoyang-le.  
I yesterday BEI teacher well ADV praise:COM

This particular instance of the bei passive can either be interpreted ironically as "Yesterday I was praised resoundingly by the teacher. - She gave me 4 out of 10" or "She told me I'd completely misunderstood the point" or as belonging to the context where the person praised finds such an event exceedingly embarrassing.

This adversative interpretation resulting from expression by means of a passive construction is clearly the converse to that of an active form construction which does not undergo such a semantic transformation:

18.        Laoshi zuotian biaoyang - le wo.  
teacher yesterday praise : COM I  
Yesterday the teacher praised me.

Not only is this the case for predicates which intrinsically denote fortunate events (in terms of the societal consensus) but also for what can be called 'neutral' events:

19.        Zheiben zazhi bei ta fan - le jiye.  
this:CL magazine BEI he turn : COM several pages  
This magazine was glanced through by him (to my annoyance).

The latter example has the implication that whoever glanced through the magazine, perhaps flipping through a few pages in a casual way, shouldn't have done so. Thus the event is viewed as causing an undesirable state of affairs for the 'owner' of the magazine. This

adversative implication is not a feature of possible active counterparts, for example, the intentional ba construction:

20.        Ta ba zazhi fan le ji ye.  
          he BA magazine turn COM several pages  
  
          He glanced through the magazine.

The Linguistics Institute (Yuyansuo) (1953:30) also remark upon the 'changed' meaning of some neutral predicates in the passive, without committing themselves definitively to any viewpoint:

Wo xie zi [I am writing characters] cannot be changed into Zi bei wo xie le [The characters were written by me] because 'write' cannot express harm, unhappiness or unwillingness with respect to 'characters'.

Some other verbs denoting fortunate events such as ai 'love' and qin 'kiss' need both a clear context and much verbal modification to form acceptable bei passives, as simply the verb plus the aspect marker le is insufficient to meet other semantic requirements such as that of completiveness (discussed in 1.3) or "transitive action" (1.4), let alone that of expressing adversity. Thus there are no Chinese bei passive equivalents of the English be passives "Xiao Mei was loved (kissed) by Zhang San" as demonstrated by the unacceptability of (21):

21.        \*Xiao Mei bei Zhang San ai (qin) - le.  
          (name)    BEI (name)    love (kiss) : COM

Once the adverse state of affairs for the subject-undergoer is made explicit by either a more complex predicate or by the given context, the bei passive becomes acceptable:

22. Xiao Mei bei Zhang San ai de budeliao.  
(name) BEI (name) love EXT extremely

Xiao Mei 'suffered' Zhang San loving her to the point of desperation.

23. Xiao Mei zhen de bu xihuan ta, you bei ta qin - le.  
(name) really not like him, again BEI he kiss :COM

Xiao Mei really can't stand him, but she was kissed by him again. [e.g. She suffered from being kissed by her uncle who she dislikes intensely.]

The last example belongs to a context where Xiao Mei cannot avoid being kissed, for example, one where the protagonist steals a kiss from her or where social obligation requires relatives to kiss as a formal greeting or show of affection (although the latter is an unlikely event in traditional Chinese society where kissing was never used as a form of greeting between relatives, and this largely remains the situation today).

a. Critique of the Verb Classification Method

This evidence shows that verbs cannot be classified into 'fortunate' and 'unfortunate' ones in order to predict the acceptability of bei sentences. The latter task may only be achieved by searching for the semantic 'rules' which the bei passive encodes as its grammatical meaning. Moreover, 'neutral' verbs as foreshadowed above follow the same pattern of interpretation. In the latter category we will examine some verbs of perception and cognition as well as verbs of giving and taking to show that their semantic behaviour is similarly only predicted and adequately accounted for by the adversative restriction on the bei passive, as opposed to being able to be predicted by the verb classification method or by a Case Grammar analysis.

Shuo, 'to speak' is a seemingly 'neutral' verb, yet once it is encoded by the bei passive, the whole predicate comes to be interpreted as 'to talk about someone to their detriment'. Again much verbal modification is needed to make the state of affairs unambiguously adversative:

24.        \*Mali bei ren shuo - le.  
          (name) BEI people speak : COM

25.        Mali bei ren shuo de bu hao yise.  
          (name) BEI people speak EXT embarrassed

Mary was embarrassed by people talking about her.

The use of bei in (25) does not exclude the possibility of the agent ('other people') saying nice things about Mary or even praising her. The crucial interpretation is that it is clearly an unpleasant state of affairs which results for Mary when bei is used to express this event.

Verbs of perception and cognition such as zhidao 'know' tingjian 'hear' and kanjian 'see' undergo the same semantic transformation in the bei passive:

26.        Neijian shi bei Li Si zhidao - le.  
          that:CL matter BEI (name) know : COM

That matter was found out about by Li Si to my misfortune.  
(I didn't want him to know about it.)

27.        Gangcai shuo de hua bei Xing Furen de yatou tingjian-le.  
          just speak REL word BEI (name) GEN maid hear : COM

What (we) just said was overheard by Madam Xing's maid to our misfortune.  
(We didn't want anyone to hear our conversation.)

28. Mali bei ren kanjian - le.  
(name) BEI people see : COM

Mary was seen by somebody to her misfortune.  
(She didn't want anyone to see her there.)

In each case, it is clearly an unfortunate state of affairs which comes about, this interpretation contrasting sharply to those of the corresponding active sentences which are purely neutral in implication. The Linguistics Institute (1953:30) points out that in examples of the bei passive with 'hear' the subject is definitely "not willing" for anyone else to listen in, and Li and Thompson (1981:495) similarly observe that

[V]erbs of perception or cognition ... do not convey pejorative meaning by themselves or in nonpassive sentences ... The bei constructions containing such verbs, however, have implications of adversity.

Li and Thompson's remark is confined as we can see to verbs of perception and cognition, although they recognize that the "major use of the bei construction is to signal adversity", while the Linguistics Institute are of the opinion that this "traditional usage" has been destroyed. Contrasting to these two viewpoints, it has been shown in this analysis that not only 'neutral' verbs of cognition and perception have the implication of adversity in the bei construction but also predicates inherently denoting fortunate events. Moreover, this grammaticalised meaning of adversity is constant for all verb types upon forming acceptable bei passives, further evidence of this being the verbs of 'giving'.

If the bei passive is a passive of adversity, it might be expected that events of giving are proscribed. This is indeed the prima facie case with the paradigm verb gei 'give':

29.            \*Mali bei ta gei - le liangben shu le.  
              (name) BEI he give:COM two:CL book INC

Once again, the English be passive "Mary was given two books by him" cannot be translated by a bei passive even in the context where the two books are ones Mary didn't want to be given. Furthermore, the semantic principle on which the exclusion of 'giving' is based is still actively operating in colloquial speech.

Despite the exclusion of (29) with the 'recipient' as syntactic subject, if the "direct object" of a ditransitive verb of giving or transferral is made into the syntactic subject of the passive and provided that it can be interpreted as a possession, then a semantically well-formed passive is produced: For example, if the two books of (29) happened to be 'mine', then an acceptable bei sentence results:

30.            Wo liangben shu bei ta gei - le Mali.  
              my two CL book BEI he gave : COM Mary

Two of my books were given away to Mary by him.

However, the event expressed is no longer one of giving but rather one of loss for the owner of the books, even though the paradigm verb 'give' has been used. Clearly we cannot write a rule to the effect that verbs of giving are proscribed from use in the passive. Once again, it is only the complete meaning of the syntactic construction which allows us to decide whether or not a particular sentence conforms to the semantic requirements of the bei passive. Thus, the first condition controlling the co-occurrence of verbs of giving with the passive is that the event is interpreted as one of loss not of gain. If an event with such a verb can never be interpreted as one of loss when it occurs in the passive, that is,

it does not undergo the kind of semantic transformation exemplified by (30), then it will be unacceptable. This point is exemplified by (31) where the predicate retains its meaning of "gain" within the overall sense of the sentence and so does not conform to the requirements of the bei passive:

31.            \*Jiangxuejin bei ta de - le.  
              scholarship BEI she get:COM

However, the same example can be used in conjunction with a context that clearly specifies an adverse state of affairs in the form of a loss for the person who wanted to win the scholarship but didn't end up doing so. Thus it needs to be part of a larger syntactic expression before it is deemed acceptable:

32.            Jiangxuejin wo mei dedao, BEI ta de - le.  
              scholarship I not get BEI she get:COM

As for the scholarship, I didn't win it, it was won by her.

Here, the topic and elided subject of the bei passive, 'scholarship' is not the semantic undergoer (or 'sufferer') but the person who imagines herself as the holder or future 'owner' of the scholarship: 'me'. The resultant state of affairs is construed as a loss for this person (2.2.2).

In general therefore, verbs of gain and giving are not compatible with the bei passive unless there is the kind of contextual modification as in (32), giving the overall interpretation of loss. When the overall interpretation of the event remains that of the subject receiving or gaining something, such as in the English be passive "Mary was bought a book by Li Si",



bei cannot be used:

33.            \*Mali bei Li Si mai le yi ben shu.  
                 (name) BEI (name) buy COM one CL book

I believe that the verb classification method can consequently be rejected as a method of analysis for the bei passive as the evidence presented here has shown that it is inadequate to account for all the facts uncovered in the data.

b.            Critique of the Case Grammar Approach

The fact that the recipient seems to be excluded from occurring as subject of the bei passive might however seem to favour a Case Grammar approach whereby a rule is written to the effect that the Benefactive Case is proscribed from the position of syntactic subject, with only the Neutral or Objective Case (associated with "ditransitive" verbs of giving and gain) being permissible. This analysis is in fact upheld by Chu (1974:449-50) who simultaneously proposes a qualified viewpoint on the adversity question:

[T]he Benefactive case cannot be subjectalized in a passive construction. This inability for the Benefactive to become the surface subject of a passive sentence may very well be one of the reasons why the passive construction mostly, though not exclusively, expresses an unfavourable occurrence on the part of the surface subject.

I would suggest that the converse of this explanation is applicable: the bei passive is a construction exclusively expressing adversative events which happen to the syntactic subject when it refers to a person, accounting for the fact that 'recipients' are generally excluded from this position, (provided that 'recipient' is semantically defined as a person who comes to have something and this is viewed as something good).

Moreover, "Benefactive", described purely in syntactic and formal terms cannot adequately describe the facts apparent in the data given above either: Even if we reclassified the semantic undergoer of (30) - 'me' - (in "Two of my books were given away to Mary by him") as the Locative Case as Chu does for the passive subjects of verbs of loss and taking away (1974:448), a Case Grammar treatment still fails to capture the generalization which could account for all the facts rather than for just some of them. Chu formalizes the structural properties of the surface subject in his conclusion (1974:451) as:

(2.4) The claim that a passive sentence only expresses an unfortunate event is false. But it seems true that some favourable events may not be put in the passive because an NP in the Benefactive Case cannot be subjectivalized.

(2.5) An NP in either the Neutral, the Dative, or the Locative Case may be subjectivalized in a Chinese passive sentence when it has more than two cases associated with it. But the Dative Case takes precedence over the Locative in subjectivalization. 21

Chu's treatment does however clarify the fact that which entities can be subjectivalized by the passive is not determined by the direct object/indirect object dichotomy: According to his analysis, it is only one kind of indirect object - the Benefactive - which is proscribed from subject position. What could be considered as two other kinds of 'indirect objects' or at least 'non-direct objects', the Locative Case and the Dative case, are shown by Chu to be possible in the bei passive (1974:448, Chu's numbering and

---

21. Chu defines his cases in terms of Fillmore (1968) and with reference to Y.C. Li (1971). Here the Neutral or Objective Case refers to what is known in more traditional style analyses as the 'direct object'.

translation):

Locative Case

- 1.29b' Wo bei ta na(zou) le nei liang ben shu le.  
'I was taken (away) those two books by him'  
  
'I had those two books taken (away) by him.

Dative Case

- 1.28a' Wo bei ta wen le xuduo wenti le.  
'I was asked (to my annoyance) many questions by him'

The counterevidence for Chu's Case Grammar analysis is found in examples such as (34) where the syntactic subject can be defined as being in the Benefactive Case according to the definition used by Chu which derives from Y.C. Li's An Investigation of Case in Chinese Grammar (Seton Hall, 1971): "the NP in the Benefactive Case may usually have the preposition gei 'for < to give' associated with it" (1974:449, Footnote 14). Consider (34) which is the counter example:

34. Mali bei Zhang San chuanran - le nueji.  
(name) BEI (name) infect : COM cholera  
  
Mary was infected with (was given) cholera by Zhang San.

The syntactic evidence for classifying the NP "Mali" as Benefactive Case is found in the active form ba construction where 'Mali' appears as the syntactic object of the preposition gei:

35. Zhang San ba nueji chuanran gei Mali.  
(name) BA cholera infect GEI Mary  
  
Zhang San passed on cholera to Mary.

I would further like to point out that neither can this event be reclassified as one of 'loss' or 'giving away' as in the previous examples (30) and (32) with verbs of giving and transferring. Secondly, bei sentences of the following type are minimally acceptable for some speakers, with the verb gei 'give':

36.           ?Mali    bei   Zhang San    gei-le   yibei   dujiu.  
              (name) BEI   (name)           give:COM one:CL poison:wine  
              Mary was given a cup of poisoned wine by Zhang San.

The subjects of both these examples (34) and (36) can be defined as the Benefactive Case according to the formal definition that Chu uses, yet they nonetheless form acceptable bei sentences contrary to his prediction. The explanation for this is that both conform to the semantic requirement of conveying an adversative state of affairs for the subject. In contrast to this, sentence (30) is unacceptable due to its not conforming to this requirement through the encoding of the event of giving two books to the subject, Mary. This situation is difficult to interpret as adversative, whereas in (36) the giving of a cup of poisonous wine to Mary, unaware of the hidden contents, is quite distinctly so. This is the generalization which Chu's analysis fails to capture. In fact, the argument for the presence of this feature in the semantic structure of the passive is finally refuted by Chu (1974:451).

In contrast to events of receiving and gain, events of taking away and loss for the underlying semantic undergoer (including verbs of giving whose interpretation in the passive comes to be one of giving away) are highly compatible with it:

38.           Wo de zixingche BEI xiao tour tou-zou - le.  
              I   GEN bicycle   BEI   thief   steal:away:COM  
              My bicycle was stolen by a thief (to my detriment).

38.        Zhexie zhengui de yishupin bei ta sui-sui  
          this:CL precious REL objets:d'art he casually  
bian-bian de song - le ren.

ADV present:COM others

These invaluable objets d'art were just given away by him as he pleased to others (as presents) (to my detriment [that is, the speaker's detriment] or my family's detriment in the case where these objets d'art have been handed down from one generation to the next by my family).

1.1.3       Imperatives and the Passive

The case of passive-form imperatives reinforces the argument in favour of postulating 'adversity' as an invariant feature of the bei passive.

Wang Huan (1957:42) is of the belief that the passive is not to be found occurring in the imperative form:

Ba sentences may be used in imperative ones whereas bei cannot. Imperatives (or sentences conveying suggestions) are sentences whose agentive characteristics are very strong, and thus are not compatible with passive characteristics.

There are several different syntactic constructions for expressing commands, requests, exhortations and advice in Chinese as in any language. Looking at only the imperative constructions, the most basic command in Chinese may be expressed by the verb form alone:

39.        Zou!  
          Leave!

Secondly, a command may be expressed by the verb phrase in conjunction with a rhetorical particle occurring sentence-finally such as a which expresses in addition the urgency of the command (cf. Chao 1968:804). [The rhetorical particle a is realized by its allomorph ya in (40) below.]:

40. Kuai jiao ta jinlai ya.  
quick tell him enter RP  
Quickly go and tell him to come in!

Thirdly, it is quite common to use the imperative construction with the pronoun 'you' retained as the subject:

41. Nimen dou zou!  
you:PL all go  
Leave (all of you)!

In accordance with Wang Huan's observation, we would not predict that the passive could be used in the imperative form. The subject of the passive is the undergoer of the event and as such does not meet the main requirement of the imperative that the subject be the potential agent of some action. This prediction is borne out by the example in (42):

42. \*Bei ta da-le.  
BEI she hit:COM

Contrasting to this, in English, be passives can be used in imperatives in a very restricted way such as in advertising language since they are not subject to the adversative constraint which makes the Chinese passive even less semantically plausible in imperative form. The Chinese passive as an imperative would have this semantic effect if usable: Do something to cause misfortune to befall you!<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, the hoardings for a circus might use the be passive to advertise the show. Note that the be passive in

---

22. However, note that this kind of meaning is conveyed by curses expressed in the form of imperative constructions, as in Polish and Russian, not to mention English: "Go to hell!",  
(contd.)

positive imperative form seems to be restricted to co-occurrence with verbs of feelings:

43.           Be amazed by the two-headed llama!  
              Be stunned by the spectacular feats of the acrobats!  
              Be dazzled by the daring dancers in the grand finale!!!

The get passive in imperative form is however a common feature of both colloquial speech and advertising language with Get rocked! (an advertising slogan commonly used for rock'n'roll concerts); Get wet! (an LP title) and on the less savoury side, expletives such as Get stuffed!

Wang Huan's statement is not completely correct however, as it is possible to use the bei passive in negative imperatives. (see also Li and Thompson 1981:503 and Chu 1974:440,444):. This is the case too for the be passive in English which proves to be unrestricted in its usage in the negative imperative.

The negative imperative of the passive is not however merely the converse of the affirmative in meaning. Rather it serves the purpose of a warning:

44.           Don't be deceived by appearances!
45.           Don't be shocked when I tell you this.

On the other hand, due to its semantic structure, the get passive (v. Chapter 4 below) can often be semantically awkward in the

- 
22.   (contd.)  
      "Go and break your neck!" etc. (Anna Wierzbicka-personal communication) There are some curses in English which take the form of passives expressed in the subjunctive mood: "You be damned!" "May your family be cursed for the next ten generations!" The latter are not passive imperatives, however.

negative imperative given the implied causal involvement of the subject in the passive event. If the context is made clear however, then the get passive is acceptable too in the negative imperative form:

46. Don't get deceived by appearances!

47. Don't get arrested at the demonstration.

The negative imperative in Chinese takes either the form BIE + VP or BU YAO + VP (cf. Ding Shengshu 1979:212). (Note that bie is a phonetic contraction of bu yao and is the preferred form in Northern Chinese):

48. Bie (bu yao) ku-le!  
NEG IMP (not want) cry:COM  
Don't cry!

A third form, similar to the third affirmative imperative construction described above, retains the second person pronoun in its structure: NI(MEN) + BIE + VP:

49. Nimen bie chao a!  
you:PL don't be:noisy RP  
Don't be noisy, you lot!

Hence the negative imperative form of the passive is BIE (BU YAO) + BEI + NP + VP:

50. Bie bei renjia pian - le.  
don't BEI people deceive COM  
Don't be deceived by others.



In English, it is clear that the be passive serves as a warning when used in the negative imperative form, provided we agree to describe warnings as speech acts which are used to alert others to the possibility of events of an undesirable nature befalling them if they carry out a certain action: Desirable events are thus not compatible with the be passive warning unless used ironically:

51.           \*Don't be given too many presents.

52.           \*Don't be awarded first prize.

This provides us with the explanation as to why the bei passive is suited to be used as a warning expressed in the syntactic form of a negative imperative, because of its component of adversity.

In conclusion, I would like to put forward the view that only a semantically based analysis can predict which occurrences of the bei passive are acceptable. Neither the verb classification approach nor Case Grammar can successfully achieve this. The semantic feature of adversity is encoded in the representation for the passive as the speaker's view: I'm thinking of it as something bad for person A.

1.2 THE SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECT

The subject cannot be indefinite in the passive.

- Lu Shuxiang (1941:61)

A consideration of the semantic characteristics of the entity acting as the subject (a notion which was defined in Section 0.1) is a necessary preliminary to the following discussion on the semantic property of completeness.

Regardless of whether or not the subject is morphologically marked for definiteness in the passive construction, the entity it refers to is always an 'identifiable' one for the speaker. Informally characterised, 'identifiability' of the subject means that the speaker is able to readily 'bring to mind' or think of the entity which is designated by the subject noun phrase.

This is a generalization which I believe makes a stronger claim than that defining the nature of the subject in terms of 'definiteness' as does Lü Shuxiang (v. quote above) since the latter definition necessarily restricts itself to grammatical definiteness, and is thus less encompassing than one in semantic terms. In the non-complex terms of the semantic representation, it is defined in this way:

Thinking of this person (or thing),

I say...

where the person (or thing) is the entity designated by the syntactic subject of the passive and 'I' refers to the speaker. I also believe that this formalisation is more precise and therefore preferable to Y.C. Li's characterisation of the subject (1976:34) in terms of 'pre-existence' - a term which is more metaphysical than accurate:

[B]ei strongly suggests that a certain pre-existing object is to be dealt with in some way ... it implies the understanding of an object before the act.

This feature is not unique to the bei passive however. It conforms to the general constraint described by Chao (1968:76-78) to the effect that in Chinese, preverbal nouns are always definite, understanding 'definite' in terms of the definition adopted in the analysis here, that is "able to be identified by you and me." It would be productive at this point to examine what are the other properties of the subject in the passive apart from it designating an identifiable entity. Chu's analysis of the bei passive in terms of cases which are permissible in subject position is thus highly relevant to our discussion and semantic characterisation of the subject.

As we saw in the preceding section where case roles were evaluated with respect to the question of adversity, according to Chu's analysis, the Benefactive Case is prohibited from subjectivization and the Dative and Locative Cases are only permissible when other associated cases are present. In contradistinction to the claims made in Chu's Case Grammar analysis, I claim that the semantic generalization which holds with regard to the nature of the subject is one where only entities of which it can be predicated

Something happened to this person (or thing) X:

can occur in subject position. In combination with the other semantic components of the representation, I believe that both a larger set of data can be accounted for and in a more systematic way than when a characterisation in terms of case is used. Chu notes in passing that neither the Instrumental nor the Factitive Case may

occur in subject position (1974:450). No explanation is offered, yet, there are sound semantic reasons as to why both these cases are typically not to be found in the passive as its subject. Moreover, the semantic formula as a whole reflects these reasons in predicting that instruments and factitive case nouns cannot act as subjects, and does so in a much more accurate way.

Despite the fact that an instrument may be thought of as having something done to it by the agent as part of carrying out an action, it may not be used as the subject, as neither does it refer to the entity which is affected by the adverse state of affairs nor is it the topic.

53.        \*Daor bei ta sha-si - le ren.  
          knife BEI he stab:kill: COM somebody

54.        \*Shitou bei ta da-sui - le chuanghu.  
          stone BEI he hit:smash: COM window

Both the subject nouns may occur as the syntactic object of the coverb (or preposition) yòng 'with' in other sentences which, according to Li's definition, determines that following nouns are in the Instrumental case (1971:20-21). Note that yòng is also used as a verb meaning 'use' as in Ni yong gao, wo yong tieqiao. "You use the pickaxe and I'll use the shovel."

55.        Ta yong daor kai men.  
          he with knife open door  
  
          He opens the door with a knife.

56.        Ta yong shitou da-sui - le chuanghu.  
          he with stone hit:smash: COM window  
  
          He smashed the window with a stone.

Instrumental phrases can only co-occur with the passive as part of the predicate, following bei:

57. Chuanghu bei ta yong shitou da-sui - le.  
window BEI he with stone hit:smash:COM  
The window was smashed by him with a stone.

The Factitive case pertains to nouns which are the cognate objects of certain 'intransitive' action verbs in Chinese. Fillmore defines it as "the case of the object or being resulting from the action or state identified by the verb, or understood as a part of the meaning of the verb" (1968:25).

In Chinese, nouns in the Factitive case are found as the second member of verb-object compounds which denote activities:

VERB + OBJECT	MEANING OF COMPOUND
<u>xie</u> + <u>zi</u> write + character	'write'
<u>xi</u> + <u>zao</u> wash + bathe	'bathe'
<u>pao</u> + <u>bu</u> run + step	'run'
<u>da</u> + <u>zhang</u> strike + war	'wage war'

As such, it is not possible for the object noun of the compound to become the subject of the passive due to the constraint on the subject explicated above: The speaker is unable to 'think of' this entity and then predicate something of it since it cannot even be identified as an individual entity at the moment of speaking. The object noun is semantically inseparable from the verb with which it forms the larger expression referring to an activity:

58.        \*Zao bei wo xi - le.  
          bath BEI I wash:COM

59.        \*Zhang bei tamen da - le.  
          war BEI they strike: COM

Secondly, in denoting activities, these compounds do not occur in the predicate of the bei passive as they are unable to encode completiveness (1.3), not to mention an adverse state of affairs for the object noun that has been 'detached' and placed in subject position.

The full semantic representation can account for both these aspects of meaning which an analysis purely in terms of Case Grammar is unable to do. Secondly, Chu's exclusion of the Factitive Case from subject position in the passive cannot explain the following kind of data:

60.        \*Zi            bei wo xie - le.  
          character BEI I write:COM

61.        Zi            bei wo xie-huai - le.  
          character BEI I write:bad:COM

The characters were written badly by me.

According to a Case Grammar analysis, the subject of (61) would be in the Factitive Case as it is in (60), since the entity referred to "results from the action" of the verb, yet only (60) is unacceptable rather than both as the Case Grammar analysis would predict. Semantically analysed, the reason for the acceptability of the passive in (61) is that the 'characters' are 'identifiable'. They are ones which are already written at the moment of speaking and thus conform to the constraint on the subject while enabling the

speaker to predicate something more about them: that they were written badly. Syntactically analysed this is due to the use of the resultative verb compound xie-huai 'write badly' which means that the subject zi 'characters' is no longer the 'cognate object' of xie 'write'. The Case Grammar analysis makes no provision for this however, either in semantic or syntactic terms.

Secondly, there is another group of verb-object compounds which form idiomatic expressions, denoting different kinds of actions. As the verb and object work together syntactically as one unit, identically to the V-O compounds denoting activities, they cannot be separated through being moved into different syntactic positions:

VERB	+	OBJECT	IDIOMATIC MEANING
<u>da-erguang</u>			
hit	+	a slap to the ear	'box the ears'
<u>jiang-jun</u>			
check	+	army	'put someone in check (chess)' or 'put someone on the spot'
<u>kou-maozi</u>			
cover	+	cap	'put a label on someone' or 'call someone a name'

When an idiomatic expression forms part of the predicate of the passive, there are no semantic complications since they refer to actions and not to activities as do the V-O compounds above. The idiom kou-maozi 'put a label on someone' is exemplified by (62) below:

62. Wenge qijian Deng Xiaoping BEI Si Ren Bang kou-shang-le  
C.R. during (name) BEI Gang of Four put:on : COM  
yiding zouzi pai de maozi.  
one:CL capitalist: REL cap  
school

During the Cultural Revolution, Deng Xiaoping was labelled a capitalist roader by the Gang of Four.

However, when the object noun maozi 'cap' of the idiom kou maozi 'label' is placed in subject position, no interpretation of the passive is possible:

63. \*Deng Xiaoping de maozi BEI Si Ren Bang kou-shang-le.  
(name) GEN cap BEI Gang of Four put:on : COM

These idiomatic compound verbs are discussed further in Chapter 3 on the Adversative Bei Passive of Bodily Effect (the passive with a 'retained object').

In conclusion, the subject of the bei passive must be the true semantic undergoer, a feature which is formalised by this part of the semantic representation for the general passive:

Thinking of this person (thing) X,  
I say:  
Something happened to X:

The argument for the completiveness of the event is put forward in the next section.

\*\*\*\*\*



1.3 COMPLETIVENESS

It was pointed out in section 0.2 that the morpheme bei of the passive construction can be etymologically traced back to a verb which had the two distinct meanings of 'cover' and 'suffer'. Furthermore, both these meanings stemmed from the even earlier meaning of 'put on the body' (Wang Li 1957:10).

This original grammatical function was lost in the course of time as bei can no longer be used as a main verb in Modern Chinese, despite the claim to the contrary that bei has never lost its "pure verbal force" made by the grammarian Gao Mingkai (1957:207). That bei no longer functions as a verb is however not only supported by other grammarians such as T.N. Nikitina (1958:220) and Zhao Enzhu (1956:48) but also to be observed from example (64):

64.        \*Mali bei-le.  
           Mary BEI:COM

Only one of the two earlier verbal meanings - 'cover' - is preserved in nouns and compounds of present-day usage:

65.        beizi 'quilt'  
           beiru 'bedding'

The second meaning of 'suffer' is the precursor of the use of bei in the modern-day passive, the development of which is outlined in section 0.2 above.

The loss of the verbal function of bei contrasts with the situation for the three purely colloquial passives formed by the morphemes jiao, rang and gei, the latter all still being used as main verbs in other non-passive constructions with the meaning of

'tell', 'let' and 'give' respectively. Secondly, jiao and rang are also used as causative verbs 'make' and 'have (someone do something)', more on which follows below in Chapters 1 and 2 of Part II, while the morpheme gei is also used to form dative and benefactive constructions, the subject of Part III. Note that the following analysis of the syntax of the bei passive is intended to include rang and jiao.

Regardless of whether we consider the morpheme bei to be a coverb (Li and Thompson 1981:492); an auxiliary verb (Linguistics Institute 1953:30) or a preposition (Lú Shuxiang 1980:57), a further feature grammaticalized by the passive construction is that of completiveness, specifically the completion of the passive event. There are different syntactic strategies available for achieving this semantic end, each being discussed in turn below:

### 1.3.1 The Completive Aspect Marker -le:

The major syntactic strategy for signalling the completion of an event is the use of the completive aspect marker -le. In this respect, the bei passive resembles the causative ba construction as both encode the feature of completiveness as a semantic invariable.<sup>23</sup> Compare the bei constructions in (66) and

---

23. Here the usage of the bei passive and the ba construction as complete utterances and not as subordinate clauses is intended.

Strangely, Nikitina claims that aspectual marking is only obligatory for the jiao and rang passives and not for bei (1958:219):

Peculiar to jiao and rang passives, an aspectual indicator is obligatory for the predicate: the predicate must be a verb in a perfective or resultative aspect... For the bei passive, this marker is not obligatory.

In contradistinction to Nikitina, I claim that all three passive constructions encode completiveness.

(67) and similarly, the ba constructions of (68) and (69):

66.        \*Ta bei Li si da.  
          he BEI (name) hit
67.        Ta bei Li Si da -le.  
          he BEI (name) hit:COM  
  
          He was hit by Li Si.

The Causative BA Construction:

- |     | NOUN PHRASE<br>(agent) | BA | NOUN PHRASE<br>(undergoer) | VERB PHRASE   |
|-----|------------------------|----|----------------------------|---------------|
| 68. | * <u>Li Si</u>         | ba | <u>ta</u>                  | <u>da.</u>    |
|     | (name)                 | BA | him                        | hit           |
| 69. | ? <u>Li Si</u>         | ba | <u>ta</u>                  | <u>da-le.</u> |
|     | (name)                 | BA | him                        | hit:COM       |
|     | Li Si hit him.         |    |                            |               |

The ba construction also features the property of a change of state for the undergoer which explains why (69) is not as semantically well-formed as (70) as the resultant state for the undergoer, ta 'he' is explicit in (70) - he became injured - whereas it is not in (69):<sup>24</sup>

70.        Li Si ba ta da-huai le.  
          (name) BA him hit:damage COM  
  
          He was injured through Li Si hitting him.

---

24. This feature of the ba construction is treated in more depth in my Honours thesis (unpublished) "Semantics of some causatives in Chinese and English", ANU, 1978, pp.17-27.

Unlike the ba construction, the bei passive does not grammaticalize an observable change of state for the undergoer. Instead it singles out the feature of adversative effect on the subject, explicated in section 1.1.

71.        Mali bei Li Si hen-si - le.  
            (name)BEI (name) hate:die:COM  
  
            Mary was intensely hated by Li Si.

Being hated by Li Si is an adverse state of affairs for Mary, but not one that causes a change of state in her.

The minimum syntactic requirement to express completiveness in the bei passive is thus the verb and the completive aspect marker -le.

The particle le forms a large number of different aspectual constructions, and as its use in the passive has been given varying interpretations, I will digress briefly to point out these different semantic functions of le and then argue for recognising its use in the passive as a syntactic exponent of the completive aspect.

It is generally recognised that le has two main grammatical functions. Occurring sentence-finally in active form constructions it signals the arising of a new state of affairs. Thus, in this function it has been described variously as an inception marker (Lu 1975:54); an inchoative marker (Teng 1973:14) or the 'change of state' le (Teng 1974:89).<sup>25</sup>

---

25. Only constructions where le co-occurs with transitive verbs are under consideration here. It also forms other inchoative constructions with stative verbs: e.g. Tian hei le "The sky is growing dark" and Xian le! "It's too salty".

72. Ta zhidao zhejian shiqing le.  
she know this:CL matter INC

She knows this now. (This is a new state of affairs, it being implied that she didn't know it before.)

The sentential use of le in (72) contrasts with its use as a verbal suffix indicating the 'perfective' or 'completed' aspect, this being the function of -le in the passive and in the next example of an active form construction:

73. Ta zhidao-le zhejian shiqing.  
she know : COM this:CL matter

She knew this.

In (73), unlike (72) there is no implication that the subject still knows this piece of information, as the sentence refers to an event which happened in the past and does not cause a state of affairs to arise which continues on into the present. Sentential le on the other hand does entail the latter in its structural meaning.<sup>26</sup>

Apart from occurring in different syntactic positions, the two kinds of le may also be distinguished by the methods of negation that are applied to the constructions they form: Verbal -le denoting completiveness may only be negated by the negative marker

---

26 Verbal -le is generally known as the 'perfective' le (Teng 1974:89) or the aspect marker le (e.g. Lu 1975:54). Y.R. Chao was probably the first to suggest the English terminology of the verb suffix le vs sentential le. He also pointed out that the former would normally be translated by the preterite in English while the latter would use the perfect tense (1968:798), which jars slightly with the currently vogue term of "perfective" aspect marker for the former and not for the latter. To avoid confusion, I call the verbal suffix -le the 'completive' aspect marker (COM) and sentential le, the inchoative aspect marker (INC). Note that Li and Thompson (1982) call verbal -le, "perfective" and sentential le the "perfect".

mei (you) with -le being simultaneously deleted. This negates the assumption that a certain event ever took place, the relationship evident between (74) and (75):

74.        Ta mai-le shu.  
          he buy:COM book  
  
          He bought books.

75.        Ta mei you mai shu.  
          he    NEG<sub>2</sub> buy book  
  
          He hasn't bought books.

Sentence (76) using another negative marker bu is not a contradiction of (74):

76.        Ta bu mai shu.  
          he NEG<sub>1</sub> buy book  
  
          He didn't (want to) buy books/He wouldn't buy books.

Only (75) can serve to contradict the statement made in (74) as when bu is used as a negative marker with animate subjects the construction expresses the subject's not wanting to do something and not that the event did not happen. (cf. Chao 1968:782; Teng 1974:86 and Li and Thompson 1981:423) This explains why only bu can negate statements about future events (cf. Lu 1980:341), the future regularly being expressed with the aid of verbs such as yao 'want' and xiang 'thinking of' in Chinese and not through morphological marking on the verb:

77.        Ta bu (\*mei) yao qu.  
          he NEG<sub>1</sub> (\*NEG<sub>2</sub>) want go  
  
          He doesn't want to go.

Sentential le, on the other hand, is negated in an entirely different way. In the negation of verbal -le exemplified by (75) above, -le as we have seen, is suppressed to form the negative with mei (you), both being mutually exclusive constituents. Verbal -le never co-occurs then with its negative marker mei (you), shown by (78):

78.           \*Ta mei you mai-le shu.  
          he   NEG<sub>2</sub>   buy:COM book

Sentential le has its negative counterpart in the choice of two constructions, one with bu...le and the other with mei...le. Thus, the negative counterparts of (79)

79.           Ta mai shu le.  
          he buy book INC  
  
          He buys books now

could be either (80)

80.           Ta bu mai shu le.  
          he NEG<sub>1</sub> buy book INC  
  
          He no longer buys books.

or (81):

81.           Ta mei you mai shu le.  
          he   NEG<sub>2</sub>   buy book INC  
  
          He doesn't buy books anymore, (having stopped at a certain point of time in the past).<sup>27</sup>

In all these constructions - affirmative and negative - the expression with sentential le refers to the present state of

---

27. Some of the preceding examples are adapted from Lu (1975); my translations and numbering.

affairs for the subject caused by a past event. In contrast, constructions with verbal -le express events that have taken place in the past and imply no effect on the subject's present situation.

Li and Thompson (1981:187) contend that verbal -le does not express completion but rather that it refers to a bounded event, viewed in its entirety. Such paraphrasing complicates rather than explicates. The use of verbal -le is typically in complex constructions denoting 'events-in-series' such that example (74) ("He bought books") usually does not constitute a complete utterance in itself until it is expanded into the form of (82):

82.        Ta mai-le shu, jiu hui jia.  
          he buy:COM books, then return home  
  
          He bought books, then returned home.

We would expect verbal -le to be heavily used in narratives as is the preterite tense in English, by which it is usually translated.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that verbal -le and sentential le together form a third aspectual construction which serves as a complete utterance on its own:

83.        Ta mai-le shu le.  
          he buy:COM book INC  
  
          He has been buying books for a while.

Compare (83) with (74) "He bought books" using verbal -le and (79) "He buys books now" using sentential le.

Consider these further examples from Chao (1968:799 - my numbering) which contrast verbal -le with the third construction containing both verbal and sentential le:

84.        Wo jiao-le si-shi nian de shu.  
          I teach:COM forty year REL book  
  
          I taught for forty years (and am now retired).



85.        Wo jiao-shu jiao - le si-shi nian le.  
I teach:book teach:COM forty year INC  
I've been teaching for forty years (and still am).

Usually, it is easy to distinguish verbal -le from sentential le as in active constructions such as (74) with a transitive verb and its object, the verbal -le is prevented from occurring at the end of the sentence by the presence of this object, without which it could otherwise be confused with sentential le. (Verbal -le always immediately follows the verb).

The problem is presented by cases with an intransitive action verb as here no postverbal object occurs. Out of context, it is not possible to tell which of the constructions with le such an example belongs to as sentential le is prohibited from immediately following verbal le:

86.        \*Ta lai - le le.  
she come : COM INC

Chao observes that "Mandarin always avoids a repetition of the same syllable by way of haplology: -le le → -le" (1968:247) and indeed there is only one possible syntactic form comprising the subject, verb and one single le:

87.        Ta lai le.  
she come ?

Of course, without context this is ambiguous between the readings of "She came", "She's here now" and "she has come".

Consequently, Chao claims ambiguity for the ba construction where the verb typically occurs in sentence final position (1968:247 - my numbering):

88.            Ni ba zheige beizi xi-ganjing le.  
              you BA this:CL cup wash:clean LE

Command:(1) Wash this cup clean!

Statement: (2) You have washed this cup clean.

However, this ambiguity is due to the fact that the imperative may take the same form as a declarative sentence, retaining the subject ni 'you' rather than being due to the use of le (1.1.3). Teng (1973:24) takes the contrary position, claiming unequivocally that it is verbal -le which is found in the ba construction. Li and Thompson (1981:297) similarly give the le in this construction one unambiguous interpretation, but not as verbal -le, rather as sentential le, which they describe as expressing the "currently relevant state" (CRS). This is due to their analysis of the event depicted in a ba construction such as (88) as not being "bounded ... temporally, spatially or conceptually" (1981:185 ff.), the requirements for verbal -le as they see it. Chu concurs with their viewpoint, analysing it as a 'change of state' le (1974:441).

The function of verbal -le is also viewed by Li and Thompson as contrasting sharply with that of sentential le. The "Currently Relevant State" signalled by sentential le is defined by Li and Thompson in their article specifically dealing with this aspect marker as "a state of affairs (which) has special current relevance to some particular Reference Time" (1982:23). Here they present the five main ways in which this "basic communicative function" of le is manifested, such as changed state, correction of a wrong assumption, reporting of "progress so far" and so on (1982:28).

Returning to the problem of example (88), we find that in fact, any construction which is verb-final will prove to be

"ambiguous" with respect to which le is being employed, at least out of context, with the topic-comment construction, the ba construction and most pertinent to the discussion, the bei passive all falling into this category.

Li and Thompson (1981:298) claim further that in some cases, a le in sentence final position could be expressing the functions of sentential and verbal -le simultaneously, that is, it could signify both a bounded event and a currently relevant state (completion of the event and inception of a new state of affairs according to the descriptive terms I have been using). This is in fact the analysis given for the bei passive (1981: Chapter 16) for most of the examples:

- (2)            ta bei jiejie ma LE  
              3 sg BEI older: scold PFV/CRS  
  sister

S/He was scolded by (his/her) older sister.

(1981:492 - their numbering and translation)

If we use the recognised method for distinguishing sentential le from verbal -le - that of pinpointing which of the negative constructions is the correct counterpart<sup>28</sup> of the bei passive - we have to conclude that it is verbal -le - the aspect marker of completion - which is involved. The passive in (89) below has its negative counterpart in (90) using the mei(you) construction which causes the -le of the affirmative passive to be suppressed as explained above and exemplified by the active-form sentences (75) and (78).

---

28. Teng Shou-hsin advocates this method (1973:33).

89.        Zhang San bei Li Si da le.  
          (name)     BEI (name) hit COM

Zhang San was hit by Li Si.

90.        Zhang San mei you bei Li Si da.  
          (name)     NEG<sub>2</sub>   BEI (name) hit

Zhang San hasn't been hit by Li Si.

There is no negation of the bei passive retaining the final le as there is for active constructions with sentential and inchoative le: For example (89) cannot be considered to contain the sentence final inchoative le construction as it has no corresponding negated form with mei(you)...le (as (91) shows) that could give the meaning "Zhang San hasn't been hit by Li Si anymore for a while now":

91.        \*Zhang San mei you bei Li Si da le.  
          (name)     NEG<sub>2</sub>   BEI (name) hit INC

This also serves as more evidence for our contention that the passive does not express the arising of a new state of affairs for the subject. If it did, it should then be able to co-occur with sentential le, the syntactic exponent which as I have explained indicates the inception of a new state. Examples (90) and (91) show conclusively that bei patterns like the active constructions with verbal suffix -le (or completive -le) with respect to the choice of negative constructions.

Secondly, we find examples of the bei passive with verbal classifiers occupying the sentence final position which the grammatical particle le precedes. This shows that the le in question must be verbal -le again.

92.           Zhang San bei Li Si da -le yidun.  
              (name)       BEI (name) hit:COM one:CL

Zhang San was given a beating by Li Si.

Similarly, in the bei passive of bodily effect (q.v. Chapter 3) where we find a second or 'retained object' following upon the main verb in the predicate, the particle le once more does not occupy sentence final position:

93.           Mali bei caoyuan de baofengxue dong-huai - le  
              (name) BEI grassland GEN snowstorm freeze:damage:COM

liang shou.

two hand

Mary had both her hands frozen badly in the snowstorms of the grasslands.

Based on this syntactic evidence, the grammatical particle le found in the passive construction can be classified as the completive aspect marker (COM) and not the inchoative sentential le (INC). As we examine the other syntactic strategies used to encode completion of the passive event, more semantic evidence for this feature will be revealed.

\*\*\*\*\*

### 1.3.2 The Durative Aspect Marker -zhe:

In the previous section, it was shown that predicates without the aspectual marking of -le such as that in (66) cannot co-occur with the passive as they do not conform to the semantic requirement of expressing completion of an event. Precisely for this reason, predicates in the durative aspect are not compatible with bei. The durative aspect marker -zhe may be treated in a similar way to the completive aspect marker -le as a verbal affix:

94.           \*Zheipi xiao ma bei ta cihou -zhe.  
              this:CL little horse BEI he serve :DUR

Only when the particle bei is omitted to form a topic-comment construction do we obtain an acceptable sentence:

95.           Zheipi xiao ma ta cihou -zhe.  
              this:CL little horse he serve :DUR

This little horse is being looked after by him.

The meaning encoded by the durative aspect cannot be reconciled with that of the completion of the passive event encoded by bei. There are two main constructions using the durative aspect with verbs of intentional action. The first construction denotes that an activity is in progress for a certain period of time, concurrent with a second event, action or state of affairs, the latter being indicated by the main clause of a complex sentence:

96.           Yige ren zuo-zai taiyang dili, guai lingqiao de  
              one:CL person sit:at sun place:in, very nimble ADV  
feng -zhe.  
              sew : DUR

One person was sitting in a sunny spot, very nimbly sewing.

97.           Zhanshimen zou zai shanjiao xia, zhidian -zhe shantou.  
              soldiers walk at mount. foot below, point:DUR peak

The soldiers walked along the foot of the mountain, pointing at the mountain top...

Only action verbs whose meaning is suited to this interpretation of ongoing activity are compatible with -zhe. Verbs such as dadao 'overthrow' and jueding 'decide' which include the endpoint of the action in the meaning are thus excluded.<sup>29</sup>

---

29. See Ren Xueliang, A Comparative Grammar of Chinese-English, (1981), p.164 for a comprehensive list of verbs which do not take the durative aspect marker.

In order to precisely explicate why the semantic structure of the bei passive is incompatible with durative constructions, this first construction with -zhe can provisionally be given the representation:

Person A (the subject and agent) is doing something  
that s/he wants to do for a certain period of time

The second construction with the durative aspect marker -zhe expresses that the state of affairs involving the subject and caused by his or her prior action, is being sustained for a certain period of time. This construction is 'self-sufficient' in that it does not need to be part of a larger complex sentence as does the first one.<sup>30</sup>

98. Ta zhi you shi-ba sui, shu -zhe shuang bian,  
she only have eighteen years, comb:DUR pair plaits,  
chuan -zhe baise changpao...  
wear :DUR white long:gown

She was only eighteen, putting her hair into two plaits and wearing a long white chongsam.

For the second durative construction, I tentatively propose a semantic representation of this form:

Person A (the subject) comes to be in a state  
s/he wants to be in for a certain period of time  
because of something s/he (A) did

---

30. Jing Shijun, Xiandai Hanyu Xiuci, (1980), p.300 provided the only analysis of -zhe where 'two meanings' for -zhe used with action verbs are pointed out, although he does not recognize two different syntactic constructions. (The case of -zhe used with adjectives is not relevant to the present discussion and thus not treated.) Li and Thompson (1981:221) recognize the use of -zhe in simple and complex constructions but their analysis is different to mine.

Neither of these durative constructions is semantically suited for use in the bei passive since in the passive, the subject is not the agent and thus cannot be understood to carry out any intentional action and secondly the action depicted by the passive is not one which is ongoing, that is, it cannot be a non-completive action. The components representing these features in the passive are:

Something happened to person A (the subject and undergoer)

because someone else (an agent) did something

As both durative constructions are concerned with predicating something of an agent who is the sentential topic: specifically either an ongoing activity or a sustained state of affairs, the inception of which is caused by the agent, neither are able to refer to the agent of a passive event, who is not the topic or subject and has only a secondary role in the illocutionary force of the passive expression (0.1). Therefore, the use of -zhe to indicate non-completion of an action or a sustained state of affairs causes it to be incompatible with the bei passive.

\*\*\*\*\*

### 1.3.3 The Experiential Aspect Marker -guo:

A third aspect marker in Chinese, the experiential aspect marker -guo, unlike the durative aspect marker -zhe, may be used in the bei passive in place of the completive aspect marker -le with the meaning of the subject having experienced the passive event at least once in the past. Guo also acts as a verbal affix:



99.            Mali bei ta pian -guo.  
                  (name) BEI he deceive:EXP

Mary had the experience of being tricked by him.

Not only is this aspect marker concerned with predicating something about the subject in terms of experiencing an event and thus suiting it to a construction where the topic is the undergoer, but since it pertains to past experience, it also encodes definitively that the event has taken place (cf. Ren Xueliang 1981:173).

1.3.4            Negation

The strongest piece of evidence to support the claim that the bei passive only expresses completed events is the fact that negation of the main verb in the predicate is not permitted.<sup>31</sup> This means that the verb of the bei predicate is always in affirmative form. If the passive construction is to be negated then the negative marker must precede both bei and the predicate:

SUBJECT    NEGATIVE MARKER    BEI    AGENT    VERB PHRASE

and not the verb phrase as in active constructions, a point exemplified by (100):

\*SUBJECT            BEI    AGENT    NEGATIVE MARKER    VERB PHRASE

100.            \*Li Si bei Mali bu / mei(you) kun-qilai.  
                  (name) BEI (name)    NEG<sub>1</sub> / NEG<sub>2</sub>            tie:up

The semantic effect of negation within the predicate would be to deny that the agent carried out any action against the

---

31. cf. Guo Derun (1981:42-43); Li and Thompson (1981:502-3).

subject of the passive sentence. Yet, at the same time, due to the use of the passive form, interpretation is being sought for what the agent did in fact do to cause an adverse state of affairs to arise for the subject-undergoer. It is comparable to trying to interpret the English sentence: "John underwent Bill not hitting him".

The two main negative constructions with bu + VP and mei(you) + VP were semantically described above in (i). Due to their semantic characteristics, only mei(you) is suited to be the form of negation for the passive.

When mei(you) is used to negate the passive, it has the identical semantic effect as in active constructions. - It contradicts the assumption that the (passive) event ever took place. Consider (101):

101.        Li Si mei(you) bei Mali kun-qilai.  
             (name) NEG<sub>2</sub>                BEI (name) tie:up

Li Si hasn't been tied up by Mary (such an event never happened).

Secondly, as described above, the use of the negative marker bu contradicts the assertion of a certain person wanting to cause an event or having caused the event but not the assertion of the event itself. The appropriate inference with bu is that the event took place but another person was the agent responsible for causing it. For this semantic reason, the negative bu may not be used with the passive construction since the subject which it syntactically follows and refers to is not an agent but an undergoer:

102.        \*Li Si bu bei Mali kun-qilai.  
             (name) NEG<sub>1</sub> BEI (name) tie:up

Thus, only the construction with mei(you) is properly used to form the negative counterpart of the passive, in its contradiction of the event rather than in its contradiction of an agent's intention to do something (1.3.1). If, however, the passive is embedded in a nominalizing shi...de construction<sup>32</sup> which can be used to put an agent into focus as in (103):

103.     Shi ta zuo de.  
          SHI he do DE  
  
          He's the one who did it.

to produce the passive

104.     Li Si shi bei Mali kun-qilai de.  
          (name) SHI BEI (name) tie:up DE  
  
          Li Si was tied up by Mary.

then this may be negated by bu:

105.     Li Si bu shi bei Mali kun-qilai de.  
          (name) NEG<sub>1</sub> SHI BEI (name) tie:up DE  
  
          Li Si was not tied up by Mary (someone else did it).

It is clear that this use of bu cannot genuinely be regarded as the negation of the passive form but rather as the negation of the shi...de form. Hence, the bei passive may only be negated by the use of mei(you) unless it is embedded in other syntactic constructions as in (104) above. Mei(you) is the negative marker one would predict would apply to a passive which expresses completiveness of an event and uses aspect markers such as verbal -le to achieve this semantic end.

---

32. The shi...de construction is discussed in detail in Li and Thompson (1981:587-593).

1.3.5 Modal Verbs

Similarly, the use of modal verbs in the predicate contradicts the semantic property of completiveness by expressing either the future possibility of an event or that the agent has the ability to carry out a certain action. Two modal verbs neng 'can' and hui 'be possible' (among their other meanings) are treated here as being fairly representative.

The modal verb neng never co-occurs with the completive aspect marker -le; that is, with verbal -le:

106. Xiao Mei neng shuo Riyu.  
(name) can speak Japanese  
Xiao Mei can speak Japanese.

107. \*Xiao Mei neng shuo -le Riyu.  
(name) can speak:COM Japanese

whereas it does occur with the sentential and inchoative le:

108. Xiao Mei neng shuo Riyu le.  
(name) can speak Japanese INC  
Now Xiao Mei can speak Japanese.

Since this modal verb refers to the ability of the subject to do something just as bu refers to the subject's intention of not wanting to do something, that is, both require an agentive subject, neng cannot be used in the passive where the subject is the undergoer:

109. \*Mali neng bei jingcha zhua-dao - (le).  
(name) can BEI police arrest : (COM)

The fact that neng cannot co-occur with the completive aspect marker -le in active form sentences as in (107) above would also lead us to suspect that neng would be semantically incompatible with the passive.

The situation is the same for the negated form of the modal verb: bu neng 'cannot' as it may not co-occur with the passive either, shown by (110), unless the passive construction has been 'nominalized' through the use of the shi...de construction, exemplified by (111): However, here the meaning of bu neng is understood as 'not be possible' rather than 'cannot', whereas the affirmative form neng in the passive is restricted to the latter 'ability' sense:

110.        \*Mali bu neng bei jingcha zhua-dao -(le).  
            (name) NEG<sub>1</sub> can BEI police arrest :(COM)

111.        Mali bu neng shi bei jingcha zhua-dao de.  
            (name) NEG can SHI BEI police arrest DE

It's not possible that Mary's been arrested by the police.

In contrast to neng, the verb hui refers to ability in the sense of knowing how to do something and may be used as a main verb with this meaning:

112.        Mali hui Yingwen.  
            (name) can English

Mary knows how to speak English.

Hui, when used as a modal verb, strongly affirms the likelihood of occurrence of an event as opposed to the meaning of 'possibility'

rendered by neng, in one of its senses:<sup>33</sup>

113.        Ta hui daying  
             she will agree  
  
             She will agree.

Thus hui may be used in both the affirmative and negated passives, provided it precedes the morpheme bei and never occurs in the predicate.<sup>34</sup> Like bu neng, it qualifies the nature of the event, not the subject.

- 114(a)     Mali (bu) hui bei jingcha zhua-dao - le.  
             (name) (NEG) can BEI police arrest : COM  
  
             It's (not) likely that Mary has been arrested by the police.

- (b)        \*Mali bei jingcha (bu) hui zhua-dao - (le).  
             (name) BEI police (NEG) can arrest :(COM)

This section has argued in favour of considering the completive nature of the passive event to be a semantic invariant of the passive construction. The main strategy used to encode this feature was demonstrated to be the completive aspect marker -le and less commonly the experiential aspect marker -guo. At the same time, the two main functions of le were distinguished: its verbal use encoding completiveness and its sentential use encoding the

---

33. Neng and hui cannot be negated by mei (you) when used in the senses outlined above that are appropriate for the passive (v. Lü 1981:244-245 and 367-369).

34. The notion of 'possibility' is better rendered by keneng:

Mali keneng bei jingcha zhua-dao-le  
(name) possible BEI police arrest : COM  
It's possible that Mary has been arrested by the police.

inception of a new state of affairs. Here it was shown that only the completive aspect marker was used with the passive and not the latter.

Further evidence supporting the claim that the semantic property of completiveness is grammaticalised by the passive construction was shown in the fact that syntactic constituents such as negative markers, modal verbs and the progressive aspect marker which all have the general semantic effect of encoding 'non-completion', were unable to occur in the passive predicate.

1.4 VERB RESTRICTIONS OR THE DISPOSAL NATURE OF BEI:  
A COUNTERARGUMENT

Linguists writing on the topic of passives in Chinese generally point out that only transitive verbs are suitable for use in such constructions, and then only those of a 'disposal nature'. This description is derived from Wang Li's Theory of Chinese Grammar in which the ba construction is characterized as the "Disposal Form" because it is used to "dispose of the object through the action of the verb" expressing "how people are organized, controlled and treated or how things are dealt with and put into effect" (1947:163,161).

Wang Huan (1957:41) takes up this theme, pointing out that transitive verbs which do not have the meaning of disposal mainly cannot occur in the bei passive either: "There seem to be no verbs which can be used in ba sentences and not be used in bei sentences".

Li and Thompson (1981:501) also characterise the bei passive in terms of disposal:

[T]he bei sentence also describes an event in which an entity or person is dealt with, handled or manipulated in some way. This is why, just as with the ba construction, bei is not found with verbs that do not signal disposal, even if they have adverse meaning.

However, Wang Huan goes on to make the remark that there are in fact "some verbs which can be used in bei sentences but not in ba sentences such as zhidao 'know', kanjian 'see', tingjian 'hear', pengdao 'bump into', xinren 'believe' and yonghu 'protect' (1958:41)". Hong Xinheng (1956:27) also points out that verbs describing mental activities are proscribed from the passive, which



he exemplifies with xihuan 'like' (my numbering):

115.        \*Ta bei wo hen xihuan-le.  
            he BEI I very like : COM

In section 1.1 of Part I, I have already argued the case against verb classification being used as a method of analysis. Wang Huan's list of verbs is not exhaustive, nor could it be, while her observation that the kind of verbs occurring in the bei passive mainly overlaps with that occurring in the ba construction with the addition of the ones listed above, is indicative I believe, of the difference in meaning between these two constructions and that moreover they should be treated separately in analysis rather than showing any great commonality of meaning.

Hong Xinheng's description of the verbs co-occurring in the bei passive is, on the other hand, too imprecise as even Wang Huan's list contains a counterexample in the form of the verb zhidao 'know' which fits the description of a verb of 'mental activity' yet is acceptable in the bei passive [q.v. example (26) above]. Furthermore, the reason for the incompatibility of the verb xihuan 'like' with the passive in (115) is not explained by its being a verb of "mental activity" either as we will see below nor by its not being lexically adversative for as we have seen above in section 1.1, even the verb ai 'love' may co-occur with the passive [q.v. example (22)] despite its non-adversative nature as a single lexical item, since it does not counteract the overall interpretation of adversity: "Xiao Mei 'suffered' Zhang san loving her to the point of desperation."

In this section it will be argued that not only do many verbs of accidental happening, cognition and perception co-occur with the passive but also experiencer verbs such as 'torment', 'hate' and 'love', facts which require a refinement in analysis away from describing the bei passive in terms of requiring transitive verbs or disposal verbs to co-occur with it.

These verbs of accidental happening or emotional experience typically do not have agents as subjects in their active usage, although they display transitive syntax in being able to co-occur with 'direct objects'. When they are used in the bei passive, in a similar way to predicates which express neutral or fortunate events in active form, they undergo a semantic transformation. This is not just one that results in expressing 'adversity' however but also one where only an agentive reading for the verb becomes possible. They come to be interpreted as meaning that their subjects carried out an action intentionally. Experiencer verbs such as xihuan 'like', however, which do not have this second possible agentive reading will be shown to be excluded.

A corollary to the presentation of this evidence is to show that it is only when the semantic conditions of the grammatical construction as a whole are met that acceptable bei passives are formed, so that consideration of the verb alone cannot predict nor enable us to devise the 'rules' of acceptability.

It is true that nontransitive verbs cannot form part of the predicate of the passive: Stative verbs such as adjectives are proscribed for a start:

116.        \*Yanjing bei jidong de leishui mohu -le.  
          eye    BEI excited REL tears    blurred:COM

Sentence (116) only becomes acceptable once the stative verb mohu is combined with an explicit action verb to form the resultative compound nong-mohu 'make blurred':

117.        Yanjing bei jidong de leishui nong-mohu -le.  
          eye     BEI   excited REL tears     make:blurred:COM  
  
          (Her) eyes became blurred through tears of excitement  
          (to her disadvantage).

Similarly, verbs which are semantically and syntactically intransitive in that they refer only to effect on the subject of an event that does not extend beyond this subject to a second entity are also proscribed:

118.        \*Wo bei zhei qingjing leng-zhu -le.  
          I   BEI   this   sight     stunned : COM

The event in (118) may only be paraphrased in the form of an 'active' subject-verb construction:

119.        Wo leng-zhu-le.  
          I   stunned :COM  
  
          I was stunned.<sup>35</sup>

Even though in English it is possible, indeed quite ordinary to use experiencer verbs (also known as the Psych Movement verbs) such as 'stun' transitively, as in "The news stunned me", pure experiencer verbs cannot occur in S-V-O constructions [nor the passive, q.v. (118)] in Chinese: The person who is the experiencer must be the syntactic subject as in (119) as opposed to the unacceptable (120)

---

35. Examples from Guo Derun (1981:35-36). He is another linguist who claims more broadly that only transitive verbs can occur in the passive.

where the cause is the subject:

120.        \*Qingjing leng-zhu -le wo.  
          sight       stun     :   COM I

Wang Huan gives a list of verbs which cannot occur in either the bei or ba construction. Although most of these verbs have transitive syntax in that they may take a surface object NP in active form sentences, on closer examination they prove to be mainly verbs which indicate a state of affairs for the subject (1957:41), a generalization which Wang Huan misses out on making:

<u>you</u> 'have'	<u>zai</u> 'be at'	<u>dang</u> ( <u>jiaoyuan</u> ) 'act (as a teacher)'
<u>de (bing)</u> 'get sick'	<u>qi (zuoyong)</u> 'have the use'	<u>likai</u> 'leave'
<u>xiang</u> 'resemble'	<u>shuyu</u> 'belong'	<u>jiejin</u> 'be close to'
<u>yikao</u> 'rely on'		

All these verbs are used in expressions which are concerned with saying something about the subject and where a second entity - the undergoer of an action - is not present. (They may co-occur with other NPs of course, but these are semantically not definable as undergoers.) Chao (1968:703,705-6) similarly attempts to classify verbs into disposal and non-disposal ones.

Wang Huan does not claim that her list is comprehensive and this certainly is not the case: It is easy to think of other verbs which do not occur in the passive (or likewise in the ba construction) and are not otherwise classifiable as stative or intransitive: For example, yunxu 'allow' exhibits transitive syntax but does not co-occur with bei: Ta yunxu wo zuo ("He lets me do it") but \*Wo bei ta yunxu zuo le. Yet yunxu 'allow' meets Wang Li's description of what a 'Disposal Verb' is (see quote above).

Another drawback of a characterisation of verbs occurring in the passive as either transitive or more specifically as 'disposal' is that it cannot account for the following facts:

121. Ta bei Mali fan-si - le.  
he BEI Mary annoy:INT:COM  
He was annoyed so intensely by Mary.

122. Ta bei Mali hen-si - le.  
he BEI Mary hate:INT:COM  
He was hated so intensely by Mary.

123. \*Ta bei Mali taoyan-si - le.  
he BEI Mary dislike:INT:COM

All three verbs may be used in S-V-O syntactic constructions which are thus formally transitive: Mali hen/fan/taoyan ta. ("Mary hates/annoys/dislikes him") and thus meet this criterion, assuming a syntactic definition of transitivity was intended by the writers mentioned above, yet for some reason taoyan 'dislike' or 'detest' may not be used in the passive. Secondly, neither can the disposal classification clarify why two of the three verbs form acceptable passives as in fact none express how 'an object is disposed of', unless the idea of disposal is interpreted so broadly as to make it useless as a definition.

Li and Thompson (1981:468) save the concept of 'disposal' by qualifying their definition with the statement that

The idea of disposal can also be inferred or understood in an implicit way. For example, while sentence (21) with ai 'love' as a verb, is not acceptable because 'love' does not carry the sense of disposal,

[(21) \*ta ba xiao mao ai (S/He loves the kitten)]

sentence (27), which also uses the verb ai 'love', is perfectly acceptable:

- (27) ta ba xiao mao ai de yao si  
3sg BA small cat love CSC want die  
S/He loves the kitten so much that she  
wants to die.

... The added expression yao si 'want to die', however, hyperbolically creates an image that such intense love must have some effect on the 'small cat'. Thus, the disposal idea in (27) is not explicitly stated by the verb. The fact that the 'small cat' is dealt with in some sense is merely implied by the verb together with the added expression.

Thus, although Li and Thompson adopt the verb classification approach as the test of acceptability for both ba and bei constructions, they do make the proviso that the implication of disposal may be conveyed by other syntactic elements in combination with the verb in some cases. On this point my analysis concurs with theirs.

In the ba construction, the overall interpretation must be one where the undergoer is clearly "affected by the action". Moreover, in some constructions belonging to the general ba construction, the entity denoted by the NP following ba is more specifically understood to undergo a change of a state.<sup>36</sup> In the bei passive, while no change of state<sup>37</sup> is involved for the undergoer as an invariant feature of its interpretation (as opposed to implication in some examples), the undergoer must be understood as being affected adversely by the action of an agent (apart from one

---

36. The different ba constructions are examined in detail in my Honours thesis "Semantics of Some Causatives in Chinese and English", (unpublished), ANU, 1978.

37. Chu (1974:441-2) argues to the contrary, that there is a change of state feature encoded by the passive.

particular construction involving a natural force). This is the criterion we can use to predict which predicates involving experiencer verbs or verbs of perception, cognition and accidental happening may be used in the passive.

The subtly differing behaviour of verbs of emotion, cognition and perception shows that if they form predicates which have only a stative reading, so that no interpretation as an action is possible, then they are excluded from the passive. These are verbs such as xihuan 'like', taoyan 'dislike' and mingbai 'understand' which form predicates that are purely stative semantically as opposed to predicates formed by verbs such as ai 'love', hen 'hate' and zhidao 'know' which all take on an action interpretation in the passive. With predicates formed by verbs such as xihuan 'like', it is difficult to interpret the effect on the person who is "being liked" as this is a state of affairs which is semantically intransitive, not extending in its effect much beyond the experiencer of this feeling. On the other hand predicates formed by hen 'hate' or ai 'love' can be understood to have a direct effect upon a second person in the form of appropriate action as an expression of these feelings, either by words or deeds. The passive is very sensitive to this distinction as it is only predicates with this active interpretation which may be found in it:

124.        \*Mali bei Zhang San xihuan (taoyan) de budeliao.  
             (name) BEI (name)     like    (dislike) EXT extremely

125.        Mali bei Zhang San ai-shang - le zhi hou,  
             (name) BEI (name)     fall:in:love:COM     after,  
  
             jiao de ta bu de anning.  
             disturb EXT she not get peace

After Mary had Zhang San fall in love with her, she was disturbed so much by it that she could get no peace.

126. Mali bei Zhang San hen de bu zhidao zenmo ban.  
(name) BEI (name) hate EXT not know what to do

) Mary was hated so much by Zhang San she was at a loss to know what to do.

In order to meet the semantic requirements of the passive, experiencer verbs typically form complex predicates so that the interpretation of adversity and causal action can be made. Thus, the verbs ai 'love' and hen 'hate' modified by only the completive aspect marker -le fail to fulfil such conditions:

127. \*bei ta ai (hen) -le  
BEI he love (hate):COM

Only the complex predicates of (125), (126) and (122) with ai-shang 'fall in love', hen de bu zhidao zenmo ban 'hated so that one is at a loss to know what to do'; hen-si 'hated intensely' or others such as ai de budeliao 'loved to the point of desperation' produce semantically well-formed passives.

As for the verbs xihuan 'like' and taoyan 'dislike', even when they form complex predicates as in (124) or (123), they are nonetheless excluded due to their purely stative meaning.

The case is identical for verbs of cognition or mental activity exemplified here by zhidao 'know' as opposed to mingbai 'understand' and xinren 'trust'. In the passive, zhidao 'know' forms a predicate with the interpretation 'find out something about someone':

128. Neijian shi bei ta zhidao - le.  
that:CL matter BEI he know : COM

That matter has been found out about by him (to our detriment).



The passive in (128) implies that the information which the agent ta 'he' may only have accidentally come across is going to be used against us by him, now that he knows about it, accounting for the "active" interpretation of zhidao. In this way the direct and adversative effect can be interpreted. Predicates formed with mingbai 'understand' and xinren 'trust' express states of affairs which do not extend beyond the would-be passive agent to affect a second entity - an undergoer, and are thus excluded:

129.       \*Neijian shi bei ta mingbai - le.  
          that:CL matter BEI he understand:COM

130.       \*Neige ren bei ta xinren - le.  
          that:CL person BEI he trust : COM

Verbs of perception such as tingjian 'hear' and kanjian 'see' undergo a similar semantic transformation to that of zhidao 'know' when they are used in the passive: In non-passive expressions, these verbs are non-control verbs, that is, verbs which designate events or happenings rather than the intentional action of an agent:

131.       Zanmen de hua bei shifu tingjian -le.  
          our     GEN talk   BEI concierge hear : COM

Our conversation was overheard by the concierge.

132.       Wo de xianglian bei renjia kanjian -le.  
          my GEN necklace BEI people see : COM

My necklace was noticed by people.

In both (131) and (132), even though the concierge hearing us talk or other people catching sight of my (expensive) necklace may be accidental events, the use of the passive implies in (131) that the

concierge upon once hearing us talk continued to listen in to our conversation and in (132) whenever other people caught sight of my necklace (which I had meant to keep hidden under my blouse), they continued to stare at it, to my discomfort.

Finally, the use of action verbs dou 'tease' and qifu 'bully' are contrasted with the experiencer verbs fan 'annoy' and zhemo 'torment':

The intentional action verbs dou 'tease' and qifu 'bully' occur in the passive with the minimal predicate modification of the completive aspect marker -le.

133.       Ta bei tongxueimen dou - le yi-xia.  
          he BEI classmates tease :COM one:CL  
  
          He was given a teasing by his classmates.

134.       Ta bei tongxueimen qifu - le.  
          he BEI classmates bully : COM  
  
          He was bullied by his classmates.

Action verbs cannot however take the intensifier modification of si 'to death' to form resultative compound verbs as can the stative verbs. \*Dou-si and \*qifu-si would mean literally, if acceptable, 'tease to death' and 'bully to death' respectively, rather than 'tease very much' and 'bully very much'. This is precisely the modification which the two experiencer verbs fan 'annoy' and zhemo 'torment' need in order to be used in the passive as when they form predicates with only an aspect marker they are unacceptable:

135.       \*Mali bei ta fan (zhemo) - le.  
          (name) BEI he annoy (torment):COM

In (135) there is no clear interpretation of the agent carrying out an action, nor consequently of the adverse state of affairs arising for the subject. For example, the event denoted by fan 'annoy' is likely to be interpreted as exclusively affecting ta 'he' and not the subject 'Mary', since one ordinary non-passive use of fan is (136):

136.        Ni fan shenmo?  
              you annoy what  
              What are you getting so annoyed about?

Thus, one possible syntactic means to make a more complex predicate and thus fulfil all the semantic conditions is to use the intensifier si:

137.        Mali bei ta fan- (zhemo)-si - le.  
              (name) BEI he annoy (torment):INT:COM  
              Mary was annoyed (tormented) exceedingly by him.

We saw above that this intensifier could also be used with hen 'hate' in (122) to form a complex predicate. In the case of purely stative verbs such as xihuan 'like' and taoyan 'dislike', even when the more complex predicates with the intensifier si were formed as in (123), an active interpretation was still not possible, with the result that they can never occur in the passive.

In this section it has been shown that the acceptability of bei sentences cannot be predicted in terms of defining the verbs which occur in the passive as 'transitive' or 'disposal'. The fact that there are verbs which are syntactically transitive such as xinren 'trust' and mingbai 'understand' and yet are unable to occur in the passive combined with the fact that there are verbs which do

not have the 'disposal' meaning such as those of cognition, perception and emotion yet may occur in the passive provides us with sufficient counterevidence to reject both these methods of analysis.

The tautologous nature of Wang Li's original definition of 'disposal' (1947:161) is a further reason for rejecting the latter as it cannot be applied rigorously in the analysis of the passive nor of the ba construction:

Since the Disposal Form is specifically designed for disposing, if the action is not of the disposal nature, then the Disposal Form cannot be used.

The task of classifying verbs into disposal and non-disposal types is one that I believe can never be completed. Not only is the definition of a disposal verb too vague, but also the two lists would be open-ended. As such they may only be regarded as representative of the kinds of verbs found occurring in the passive and those which are not. Far better to try to pinpoint the overall semantic conditions operating with respect to the bei passive so that co-occurrence of verbs among other syntactic and semantic features can be predicted by the one generalization rather than to resort to lists of verbs. The formalisation of the semantic analysis of the bei passive carried out chiefly in Chapter 1 is presented in Chapter 2 below.

2. THE BEI PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

2.1 THE AGENT AND THE EUROPEANIZED PASSIVE:

Since the bei passive is not the most common syntactic strategy used in Chinese to express a passive event (0.1), several analyses have put forward the view that one of the main functions of either the morpheme bei or the bei construction is to introduce the agent as in (138) (e.g. Guo Derun 1981:29; Zhang Zhigong 1957:91):

138. Yishang bei ta si-po le.  
clothes BEI she tear:break COM

The clothes were torn to shreds by her.

If there is no agent, then the bei passive is not the syntactic form to choose for expressing the said passive event. Here the topic-comment construction will be used instead of (138) and not an agentless bei passive:<sup>38</sup>

139. Yishang ye si-po - le...  
clothes too tear:break:COM

The clothes were also torn to shreds...

140. \*Yishang bei si-po - le.  
clothes BEI tear:break:COM

---

38. Those who share this point of view are Wang Li (1947), p.178; Loh Dian-yang (1959), I, p.132; Hong Xinheng (1956), p.23; Guo Derun (1981), p.37 and Wang Huan (1957), p.47. Under this category, we can subsume cases where there is no need to express an agent or where the agent is not known.

If one of the functions of the bei passive is to make the agent explicit is it the case then that the agent is an obligatory syntactic feature? Wang Li claims this is so (1947:182):

The regular passive form in Chinese must express the agent ... sentences like Ta bei sha [He was killed] are rarely seen. Thus, when we want to translate the Occidental passive that has no "converted subject" [i.e. the "agentless passive"] into Chinese, it is often very difficult if not impossible. For example ... No reason has been assigned; No objection had been made to her conduct.

Later, in Hanyu Yufa Gangyao, (under the nom de plume of Wang Liaoyi) he elaborates on this point (1957:112):

If there is bei, then ordinarily there always needs to be an agentive phrase ... At least, the word ren [somebody] should be added, as in Women bei ren qifu [We've been treated in a cavalier manner by people].

Chu (1974:455) flatly contradicts this viewpoint with his statement "All passive sentences have underlying Agentive NP that may be deleted".

It is certainly the case in English that the agentive by phrase is not an obligatory syntactic constituent of either the be or the get passive. I propose however that in Chinese, the general bei passive can be divided into two broad categories, the agentful bei passive and the Europeanized bei passive. Hence, I am claiming that the agent is an invariant syntactic feature of the traditional bei passive while it is only in the Europeanized passive that it seems to be "optional". The Europeanized bei passive itself may be divided into agentful and agentless kinds.

The traditional bei passive did of course evolve historically from an agentless structure as was described in 0.2, the morpheme bei originally being a full verb with the meaning 'suffer from'.

What is meant by 'traditional' here is not the bei passive of the early Archaic period of Classical Chinese however, but rather the form which had developed by modern times (from the Tang dynasty 618-907 AD onwards) and is still in use today.<sup>39</sup>

The Europeanized bei passive is a modified version of the traditional passive. It came into use in Chinese early this century, making its first appearance around the time of the May 4th Movement which began in 1919.<sup>40</sup> During this period, the popular movement amongst Chinese intelligentsia espousing the aims of reforming and modernizing China was preceded and accompanied by the ready availability of translations of western literature and philosophy as well as scientific and political works for the first time.

In these translated works, the bei passive was used to translate the passive constructions of European languages leading to two modifications in the semantic structure of the traditional passive construction:

- (i) The Europeanized passive broadened in its application to include the expression of passive events both neutral and fortunate in nature and as a result lost its adversity constraint entirely.
- (ii) Through the translation of agentless passives, the Europeanized passive lost the second constraint of the obligatory expression of the agent.

---

39. The period of Modern Chinese is as defined by Wang Li (1957:12) and Wang Liaoyi (1957:432).

40. The May 4th Movement began with the incident on that date in 1919 when a demonstration was held in Beijing by students protesting against the 21 Demands of the Japanese Government, one being for China to cede German concessions in Shantung province to Japan. See also D.J. Waller, The Government and Politics of Communist China (1970), p.17. and Liu Wu Chi An Introduction to Chinese Literature (1966), p.262.

As a result, the semantic structure of the Europeanized passive bears little resemblance to that of the traditional adversative passive. A further consequence of (ii) was that the morpheme bei, used syntactically to introduce the agent in the traditional passive (as does by in English) became equated with the auxiliary verb be and the past tense inflection on the participle of the English be passive in translations from the English.

The Europeanized passive can not only be distinguished from the traditional passive in terms of semantic structure but also in terms of usage: The former is restricted exclusively to the written language, unlike the latter which is used by certain sectors of the population as a spoken form (1.1) as well as in formal registers of speech. Moreover, the use of the Europeanized passive in the written language is largely confined to journalese, political works and propaganda and to a lesser extent to some works of communist literature in China.

The impact of European languages on the bei passive in Chinese is generally accepted as far as the broadening of meaning is concerned (1.1). Moreover, its overuse and expansion outside the domain of politically-oriented works, particularly, the agentless form of the Europeanized passive, is condemned in several major treatments of the use of bei, for example, in Loh Dian-yang (1959:I, 131):

The use of bei before the verb to show the passive sense is evidently made popular by modern translators, who have recklessly introduced the English passive verbs into Chinese.

He continues this criticism by pointing out that passivized verbs such as



bei zunzhong 'be respected', bei huanying 'be welcomed', bei yi 'be translated' bei xie 'be written', etc. sound so awkward that they are still not accepted by Chinese writers.

Similarly, Lü and Zhu (1952:87) remark that examples of the agentless type such as

141. Xin bei xie-hao - le.  
 letter BEI write:finish:COM  
 (The letter has been written)

are "still not acceptable in the spoken language", supporting the claim that the Europeanized version of the passive is not used colloquially.<sup>41</sup>

Several previous treatments of bei single out two constructions, some classifying them as the 'complete' and the 'simplified' or 'simple' bei sentences, the 'simple' bei form being the agentless passive and the 'complete', the agentful passive.<sup>42</sup>

This classification corresponds only roughly to the strict division made here between the traditional adversative passive and the Europeanized passive according to their semantic structure. The Europeanized passive has this syntactic structure:

	NOUN PHRASE (undergoer)	BEI	(NOUN PHRASE) (agent)	VERB PHRASE
142.	Ta she	bei BEI	( )	xuanwei zhuxi. elect: as chairperson
	She was elected as the chairperson.			

41. Wang Liaoyi (1957:111) reiterates this point with the statement: "This kind of Europeanized grammar has not yet been adopted by the populace..." and with respect to examples such as (141) he says that "even those who like Europeanizing are not willing to add bei here (p.113)."

42. Lü and Zhu (1952:87); Guo Derun (1981); Lü (1981:56-57) and Wang Huan (1957:42).

Examples such as (142) have become formulaic in the political style of newspaper writing in China. To the contrary, in the spoken language, this meaning would be expressed by a non-passive construction:

143.        Ta dangxuan            zhuxi.  
             she be elected chairperson  
             She was elected chairperson.<sup>43</sup>

Other examples of the agentless Europeanized passive are (144) and (145):

144.        Zheige    dui    bei    chengwei   'tie guniang'   dui.  
             this:CL team   BEI   call:as   'iron girl'   team  
             This team became known as the Iron Girl team.

145.        1949 nian   Zhongguo   Renmin   bei   jiefang   -le.  
             year   China        people   BEI   liberate:COM  
             In 1949, the people of China were liberated.

Other events typically found encoded by the Europeanized passive in journalese are bei biaoyang 'be praised'; bei zancheng 'be approved'; bei guli 'be encouraged' and bei jieshou 'be accepted'. Although these events are all fortunate in nature, we will see below that misfortunate ones can also be encoded by the agentless Europeanized passive.

A further piece of evidence showing that agentless passives are not a feature of the spoken language in Chinese is provided by the two passives formed by rang and jiao. As these colloquial passives are exclusively agentful, no sentences analogous

---

43.    Loh Dian-yang (1959: II, 70) drily notes that examples such as (143) are "pure Chinese" as opposed to (142) with the 'Europeanized' passive.

to the Europeanized bei passive of (142) exist:

146.        \*Ta rang (jiao) xuanwei' zhuxi.  
             she RANG (JIAO) elect:as chairperson

Moreover, for the Europeanized bei passive with an agent, the case is identical: There are no colloquial analogues formed by either rang or jiao, as both these passives are exclusively adversative as well ( Part II, Chapters 5 and 6 below for the analysis of rang and jiao passives.).

147.        \*Ta rang (jiao) dajia xuanwei zhuxi.  
             she RANG (JIAO) everybody elect:as chairperson

For the traditional bei passive, jiao and rang counterparts can, of course be found:

148.        Yifu dou bei (rang) (jiao) yu lin-tou -le.  
             clothes all BEI (RANG) (JIAO) rain soak:through:COM

The clothes have all been soaked thoroughly by the rain.

(The semantic differences between bei, rang and jiao are the topic of discussion in Part II, Chapter 6 below.)

Having given evidence of the usage of the Europeanized passive being purely in the written sphere, we need to justify the claim that the major means of distinguishing these two constructions are their different semantic structures.

The Europeanized passive is easily separated out from the traditional passive in that regardless of whether the passive event expressed is neutral, fortunate or unfortunate for the undergoer on the lexical level, 'adversity' is not part of the meaning grammaticalized by this construction as a whole, contrary to the case for the former (presented in 1.1). The verb of the passive

predicate may denote a kind of misfortune:

AGENTLESS 'EUROPEANIZED' PASSIVE

149. Jiefang hou, tufei bei suqing - le.  
liberation after bandit BEI eliminate:COM  
After liberation, bandits were eliminated.

Here, the implication of an adverse state of affairs for the undergoer 'bandits' is attributable however purely to the lexical content of the verb and not to the syntactic construction as a whole. This is apparent from examples where the verb expresses a fortunate event as in (150), which should be compared with (17), a bei sentence of the traditional form:

'TRADITIONAL' BEI PASSIVE:

17. Wo zuotian bei laoshi hao-haor de biaoYang -le.  
I yesterday BEI teacher well ADV praise : COM  
Yesterday I was praised resoundingly by the teacher  
(to my embarrassment).

AGENTLESS 'EUROPEANIZED' PASSIVE:

150. Zheiwei jinbu de nu yiren bei biaoYang -le.  
this:CL advanced REL woman artiste BEI praise : COM  
This progressive woman artiste was praised.

Recalling that (17) could only be understood ironically as "I was criticised" or as an adverse state of affairs because the praise caused 'me' great embarrassment, (150) is to the contrary completely neutral in this respect as such a semantic transformation does not occur with it, so that no 'adversity' is grammatically expressed.

Secondly, when the agent is explicitly mentioned in the Europeanized passive, it never denotes a singular entity, that is, an individual. Consider (151):

'EUROPEANIZED' PASSIVE WITH AN AGENT:

151. \*Neiwei nu yanyuan bei Hu Zhuxi zhu-he - le.  
ta  
jingli  
 that:CL woman actor BEI Chairman Hu congratulate:COM  
 him  
 manager

The agent of the Europeanized passive is typically a group of people often viewed as a politically defined unit and always viewed en masse as an indistinguishable and non-identifiable group (the definition for which was given in (1.2):

<u>dazhong</u>	'the masses'	<u>renmen</u>	'the public'
<u>dajia</u>	'everybody'	<u>renmin</u>	'the people'

152. Neng pubian de bei dazhong jieshou, xinshang,  
 can generally ADV BEI masses accept appreciate  
ta hai bu jiu cheng - le dazhong wenyi ma?  
 it still not then become : COM masses literature Q

If it can be widely accepted and enjoyed by the masses, then wouldn't it be the art and literature of the masses?

When an event is neutral with respect to the adversity parameter, such as 'be assigned' and it is combined with an individual agent (as opposed to a collective one), the construction will be interpreted as the traditional adversative passive. Compare (153) with (154) and (155):

AGENTLESS EUROPEANIZED PASSIVE

153. Lao Sun Tongzhi bei fenpei dao Di Liu Qu lai.  
 old (name) comrade BEI assign to sixth district come  
 Old Comrade Sun was assigned to come to the Sixth District.

EUROPEANIZED PASSIVE WITH A COLLECTIVE AGENT

154. Lao Sun Tongzhi bei shangji fenpei dao  
old (name) comrade BEI higher levels assign to

Di Liu Qu lai.  
sixth district come

Old Comrade Sun was assigned to come to the Sixth District by the higher levels (of the Communist Party).

TRADITIONAL ADVERSATIVE PASSIVE

155. Di Laoshi bei xiaozhang fenpei dao ernianji qu-le.  
(name) Teacher BEI principal assign to second:year go:COM

Teacher Di was assigned to second year by the principal (to her misfortune, as she had been teaching a more advanced class before).

The Europeanized passives in (153) and (154) are neutral with respect to the resulting state of affairs for the subject, Comrade Sun - neither passive form undergoing the semantic transformation to the interpretation of an adverse state of affairs, whereas (155) means that the teacher's allocation to second year was a demotion for her.

The semantic space occupied by these two categories of bei passives, Europeanized and traditional, is mutually exclusive in the following way:

Any event, whether inherently desirable, undesirable or neutral in this respect, may be encoded by the agentless Europeanized passive, there being no grammaticalized component of meaning concerning the effect of the event on the subject, contextual inferences aside.

156. Ta bei yu wei mofang gongren.  
she BEI eulogize:as model worker

She was eulogized as a model worker.

157. Guai-guo yige wan, che bei du-zhu -le.  
turn:EXP one:CL bend, cart BEI block : COM  
After turning the corner, the cart was blocked.

2.1.1 The Agentless Europeanized Bei Passive

The agentless Europeanized passive has the following semantic formula:

AGENTLESS EUROPEANIZED PASSIVE:

NOUN PHRASE BEI VERB PHRASE  
(Undergoer)

Person A

Ta bei xuanwei zhuxi.  
she BEI elect as chairperson

She was elected as chairperson.

Something happened to person A  
because someone else did something to A  
I don't need to say who.

2.1.2 The Europeanized Bei Passive with a Collective Agent

With the agentful passives, events which are inherently neutral or desirable and involve a collective but non-identifiable agent are encoded by the Europeanized form which structurally requires an agent as one of its syntactic positions and, identically to the agentless passive, is neutral with respect to the effect of the event on the undergoer: Events of an adversative nature are not, however, encoded by it, as we will see below:

EUROPEANIZED PASSIVE WITH A COLLECTIVE AGENT:

NOUN PHRASE (Undergoer)	BEI	NOUN PHRASE (Agent)	VERB PHRASE
Person A		Group B	
<u>Li Cheng</u>	bei	shangji (*ta)	tiba dao qu-
(name)		BEI higher level (*he)	promote to district:
		<u>shang gongzuo.</u>	
up		work	

Li Cheng was promoted up to the District level to work by the higher levels (of the Communist Party).

Something happened to person A  
that these people B wanted  
because B did something to A

Note that a further semantic distinction between the Europeanized passive with an explicit agent and the traditional passive is that in all cases the collective agent of the former wants to cause something to happen to the subject of the passive.<sup>44</sup> Given that this particular passive is heavily used to describe affairs in the political arena in formulaic terms, the presence of this semantic feature is not surprising.

---

44. Also note that the general Europeanized passive construction may be further subdivided into constructions with animate or inanimate subjects:

Qiang bei da-dao-le.  
wall BEI topple:COM "The wall was pushed over."

Zheixie yijian mei you bei caina. "These viewpoints  
this:CL opinion NEG<sub>2</sub> BEI adopt were not adopted."

Only the construction with animate subjects is treated here, as examples of the Europeanized passive with inanimate subjects are even less common colloquially than the 'traditional' bei passive with inanimate subjects, - the former being purely restricted to the written language.



To summarize, any passive event involving an 'identifiable' agent either individual or collective which has the overall interpretation of adversity for the undergoer, may only be expressed by means of the traditional adversative passive: In (158), the agent Sirenbang 'Gang of Four' is 'identifiable' in terms of the definition given in 1.2 and does not denote an indistinguishable group of people:

158.        Ta bei Sirenbang        wuxian        wei        zibenjia.  
             she BEI Gang:of:Four        frame        as        capitalist

She was framed as a capitalist by the Gang of Four.

On the other hand, if speakers do not wish to express anything more than the basic passive event, that is, they do not view the state of affairs which arises for the undergoer as being adversative nor even view the event as either fortunate or neutral in this respect, then an alternative form is available - the topic-comment construction. The latter does not carry any implication of adversity or benefit whatsoever for the undergoer as part of its grammaticalized meaning.

Both these constructions - the traditional adversative passive and the topic-comment construction may be used in the written language as well where a third form - the Europeanized passive comprising two subconstructions, one agentful and one agentless - is also available for use. - If writers neither want to express their viewpoint about the kind of new situation arising for the undergoer nor need to say who the agent is involved in the passive event, then the agentless Europeanized passive is the form to select. The use of this form is typical of translated works, scientific and political writing and journalese.

Finally, when the passive event involves a collective 'non-identifiable' agent and the overall interpretation remains neutral, then the agentful Europeanized passive is the correct form to use. Consequently, only the traditional bei passive constructions can be used to convey the speaker's viewpoint and this is confined to one of adversity, in addition to expressing an agentful passive event.

The four major traditional adversative passives have their semantic representations discussed in turn in the following pages, beginning with the bei passive with a person as the undergoer.

## 2.2 THE TRADITIONAL ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVES

In the preceding sections I have shown that the semantic restrictions on the traditional adversative passive in its general form are three-fold: First of all, the subject of the passive has to be identifiable. Secondly the event encoded by the passive must be understood to be completed and thirdly, the entire passive event is viewed as adversative by the speaker. In Chapters 5 and 6 of Part II, I will further claim and justify that the bei passive as opposed to the colloquial jiao and rang passives encodes the serious nature of the event.

Furthermore I claim that there are several discrete constructions all using the passive marker bei. In spite of their identical syntactic structure, the underlying semantic structures while all containing these three semantic features differ in their other components to the extent that none can be collapsed with any other. Natural units of language will be used as the semantic metalanguage to reduce these several distinct interpretations of the passive into less complex yet more easily comprehensible semantic definitions. Each of the four traditional passive constructions is given separate treatment in this order, with the last one, the passive of bodily effect being treated in a separate chapter, Chapter 3.

- 2.2.1 Adversative Bei Passive with a Person as the Undergoer.
- 2.2.2 Adversative Bei Passive of Possessions.
- 2.2.3 Adversative Bei Passive with a Natural Force.
- 3 Adversative Bei Passive of Bodily Effect.

2.2.1 The Adversative Bei Passive with a Person as the Undergoer:

This form of the bei passive with a person as the subject is considered by some to be the most prevalent one, for example, Guo Derun (1981:38). However he explains this phenomenon as a disambiguating strategy:

[P]eople and other animate beings can take action of their own accord. If bei isn't used for some sentences, the agent-undergoer relation will not be clear and may even cause ambiguity.

He claims that if the example (159) below hadn't been changed into a passive by adding bei ta, the subject 'my elder sister' would be understood as the agent and not as the undergoer, violating the context it belongs to:

159. Zui hou, qin jiejie bei ta lian hong dai pian,  
finally, own elder: BEI he both cheat and hoodwink  
sister

lian la dai zhuai, yan-baba de gei tuo-zou - le.  
both pull and drag, helplessly ADV pass drag:away : COM

In the end, my elder sister was helplessly taken away by him, both cheated and hoodwinked and dragged along against her own will.

Guo's disambiguity hypothesis provides an interesting explanation for the prevalence of the bei passive with a personal NP as the subject. Another reason is that the adversity effect is more clearly interpretable where a person is the subject and undergoer than for inanimate subjects, since the latter cannot be thought of as being adversely affected by an event, only those to whom they belong (q.v. 2.2.2 below).

Apart from the bei passive with a natural force, the other three major constructions all have animate agents and thus require predicates of intentional action (1.4). Here is the semantic formula for the first construction:

ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVE WITH A PERSON AS THE UNDERGOER

NP<sub>P</sub>      BEI      NP<sub>AN</sub>              VP<sub>COM</sub>

Subject and              Agent  
Undergoer

Person A              Person B

- (i) Xiao Wang bei jingcha zhua-dao -le.  
(name) BEI police arrest : COM  
Xiao Wang was arrested by the police.
  
- (ii) \*Xiao Wang bei jingcha zhua-dao -zhe. (NON-COMPLETIVE)  
(name) BEI police arrest : DUR
  
- (iii) \*Mali bei ren shuo - le.  
(name) BEI people speak : COM (NO EFFECT ON SUBJECT)
  
- (iv) Mali bei ren shuo de bu hao yise.  
(name) BEI people speak EXT embarrassed  
Mary was talked about so much by people that she got embarrassed.
  
- (v) \*Mali bei ta liaojie - le.  
(name) BEI he understand:COM (NO EFFECT ON SUBJECT)
  
- (vi) \*Mali bei ta gei-le liangben shu.  
(name) BEI he give:COM two:CL book (NO ADVERSATIVE EFFECT)
  
- (vii) Mali bei ta na-zou - le liangben shu.  
(name) BEI he take:away:COM two:CL book  
Mary had two books taken away by him.

Thinking of this person (A)  
I say:

Something happened to person A (event Y)  
because person B did something to A  
I'm thinking of Y as something serious and  
something that was bad for A

2.2.2 The Adversative Bei Passive of Possessions:

The subject of this construction may be either animate or inanimate, provided it can be understood to be a person's "possession" in the sense that this person has control over or responsibility for the said object and regardless of whether this relationship between "owner" and "owned" is short-lived or enduring in nature. This relationship is simply captured by the formula "Thing X can be thought of as belonging to person A".

Thus, whenever the syntactic subject denotes a possession, the adverse state of affairs is viewed as affecting the person thought of as "owning" this thing. The "owner" may be explicitly encoded into the bei passive as in (160):

160.        Wo de liangben shu bei ta na-zou - le.  
          my     two:CL     book BEI he take:away:COM  
          Two of my books were taken away by him.

or else it may be implicit, and we need the larger structure of discourse to make this interpretation. Otherwise, the use of the bei passive is not appropriate with a non-personal subject since a state of affairs cannot be interpreted as adversative for an inanimate entity nor for an animate non-human one unless the speaker is thinking of it as a person (and then this would need a different bei construction).

To clarify this point, consider the following example: It is difficult to interpret (161) as an adverse state of affairs for

anyone: the case of a passer-by who comes across some pieces of broken tile on the road:

- 161:     ??Jikuai        wazi   bei   ren        nong-sui - le.  
          several:CL tile BEI somebody make:smash:COM  
          ??Some pieces of tile have been broken by somebody.

On the other hand, if the scene is the site of an archaeological dig where two workers have broken a porcelain bowl in attempting to excavate it, the use of this bei passive by the chief archaeologist would be quite appropriate:

162.     Neijian    ciqu    bei tamen lia nong-sui - le.  
          that:CL porcelain BEI they two make:smash:COM  
          The porcelain bowl was broken by those two.

Things which are public property, are value-less or no longer belong to anybody may be generally predicted therefore not to act as the subject of this bei passive. Consider the following three examples:

- ??Yikuai feizhi  
          one:CL waste paper  
163.     ??Dishang    de shuye } bei ta cai - le yijiao.  
          ground:on REL leaves } BEI he tread:COM one foot  
          ??The leaves on the ground were } trodden on by him.  
          ??A piece of waste paper was    }

164.     Huayuan    bei    ren    cai -le.  
          garden    BEI    someone    tread:COM

The garden was trampled over by someone.

165.     ??Lajixiang    bei    ren        nong-zang - le.  
          rubbish:bin BEI someone    make dirty:COM

??The rubbish bin was made dirty by someone.

Out of the last three examples, only (164) can have a context easily found for it, for example, the gardener who looks after this particular garden, whereas for the other two examples it is difficult again to conceive of how these events could create an adverse state of affairs for anyone.

With regard to this semantic feature of the "adversely affected owner", I disagree with Wang Liaoyi's statement (1957:113) that "When the subject is an inanimate entity, regardless of whether the event is unfortunate or unexpected, bei must not be used ...". His four examples used to support this claim are unable to occur in the passive not because they have inanimate subjects but because the predicates contain intransitive verbs or verbs in potential form such as da-bu-de 'unable to beat' in example (B). Another example, (D), contains the verb diu 'lose', a verb of accidental happening which explains why it does not co-occur with the passive (see also 1.4) (my numbering):

166.       \*Ni er gege de yu bei diu -le.  
          you second brother GEN jade BEI lose:COM

but more appropriately in a topic-comment construction

167.       Ni er gege de yu diu -le.  
          you 2nd brother GEN jade lose:COM  
          Your second brother's jade was lost.

Secondly, there is no agent given in (166) either which means that such an example violates two semantic constraints of the bei passive: that the event be caused by an action, and that the agent of this action be explicitly mentioned.



Neither can events where there is no action involved form the predicate of this passive construction. Compare (168) with (169):

168.       \*Neijian shiqing bei ta hudu - le.  
          that:CL matter BEI he confuse:COM

169.       Neijian shiqing bei ta gao-hudu-le.  
          that:CL matter BEI he make:confused:COM  
  
          That matter was muddled up by him (to our misfortune).

Similarly, if an adverse state of affairs is not encoded, unacceptable sentences result:

170.       \*Neijian shiqing bei ta nong-le.  
          that:CL matter BEI he do : COM

171.       Neijian shiqing bei ta nong de bu haoban -le.  
          that:CL matter BEI he do EXT not manageable:COM  
  
          That matter was made problematical to deal with by him.

The formula for this bei passive follows upon three more examples and the syntactic schema:

ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVE OF POSSESSIONS

NP<sub>POSS</sub> = a noun phrase designating an entity or entities which may be thought of as someone's belonging

(NP<sub>P</sub> + GEN)    NP<sub>POSS</sub>    BEI    NP<sub>AN</sub>    VP<sub>COM</sub>

(i)       Wo    de    chezi    bei   ta de chezi   zhuang-huai -le.  
          I    GEN   bike    BEI he GEN bike bump:damage :COM  
  
          My bike was broken in a collision with his.

(ii) Xiangpian bei xiao meimei si - le.  
 photos BEI little sister tear : COM

The photos were torn up by my little sister.

(iii) \*Fangzi bei ta da-sao - le. (NOT ADVERSATIVE)  
 house BEI he sweep:clean :COM

(NP<sub>P</sub> + GEN) NP<sub>POSS</sub> BEI NP<sub>AN</sub> VP<sub>COM</sub>  
 (Person A) Thing X Person B

Thinking of this thing (X)  
 which can be thought of as belonging to  
 person A

I say:

Something happened to X (event Y)  
 because person B did something to X  
 I'm thinking of Y as something serious and something  
 that was bad for person A

2.2.3 The Adversative Bei Passive with a Natural Force

In this construction, a place or locale is designated by the syntactic subject and the "agent" is no longer a person but a natural force such as the wind, rain or floods.

These structural differences are instrumental in producing a semantic structure markedly different from the other three passives with bei that have animate agents. The predicate of this passive is one of pure event, as without an animate agent, a transitive verb of intentional action is subsequently superfluous. The construction thus comprises only one entity, and may be considered "agentless" semantically.

172. Qunian qiutian zanmen cunr bei hongshui yan -le.  
 last year autumn our village BEI floods submerge:COM

In autumn of last year our village was submerged by floods.

Neither do non-adversative events occur in this passive in line with the general prediction for bei constructions made in (1.1).

173.        \*Zhuangjia bei yu jiu - le.  
             crops        BEI rain save :COM

This passive expresses natural disasters and catastrophes which occur to the detriment of the social group speakers associate a certain place with rather than to the detriment of a particular individual. The people who are adversely affected are those who live in the place where the disaster occurs or are considered to own or be connected in some way to whatever is destroyed by it.

ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVE WITH A NATURAL FORCE

NP<sub>LOC</sub>        = a noun phrase designating a place or a locale

NP<sub>F</sub>            = a noun phrase designating a natural force or phenomenon

NP<sub>LOC</sub>        BEI        NP<sub>F</sub>        VP<sub>COM</sub>

Place L

(i)        Zhengge gongchang bei huo shao-diao - le.  
             whole CL factory        BEI fire burn:away : COM

The entire factory was burnt down by the fire.

(ii)        Zhuangjia bei yu lin-huai - le.  
             crops        BEI rain soak:damage:COM

The crops were made sodden by the rain.

- (iii) \*Xiao lu bei feng gua-jing - le shuye. (NOT ADVERSATIVE)  
path BEI wind blow:clean:COM leaves

Thinking of this place L  
I say:

Something happened in this place (L) (event Y)  
not because someone did something to L  
I'm thinking of Y as something serious and  
something that was bad for the people  
associated with place L.

3. THE ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVE OF BODILY EFFECT

A complex predicate is frequently found to co-occur with the bei passive, to be precise, one where a postverbal noun is present.<sup>1</sup> According to the semantic nature of these complex predicates, distinct subconstructions of the bei passive can be singled out, a task which is carried out in the first section of this chapter.

The passive of bodily effect expresses an inalienable relation in terms of the part-whole dichotomy, in this construction, with the subject representing the 'whole' and the postverbal noun, the 'part'. In the detailed discussion of the semantic structure of this passive which ensues, it will be shown that this 'part' is always a part of the body.

In the first section, syntactic evidence is presented to argue the case that only body part terms can fill the position of postverbal noun. The semantic characterisation of the part-whole relation as one holding exclusively between a person and a part of the body is shown to be syntactically justified and this leads to the exclusion of idioms and V-O compounds from this construction. Other analyses on this topic are referred to at this point as well.

---

1 The same syntactic construction can be also found with rang. However, the rang passive of bodily effect will not be separately discussed in this chapter nor in the chapter on the rang passive. The analysis of the complex predicate involving a body part term presented here is meant to apply to the corresponding rang passive as well. The passive marker jiao is unable to form a construction of this type, the reasons for which are given in the chapter below on the jiao passive and the jiao causatives.

I would like to thank Barry Blake, Tim Shopen and Sandra Thompson for their comments and criticism of an earlier draft of this chapter.

That the resultative verb compound denoting the action and the state resulting from the passive event is an obligatory syntactic feature of this construction but not of the regular passive is one of the aspects of the syntactic differentiation carried out in Section 3.2. Here the two passive constructions are semantically differentiated as well and the more stringent syntactic requirements of the bodily effect passive shown to be due to the more specific semantics of the latter.

In Sections 3.3 and 3.4, the passive construction is compared with and contrasted to dative constructions in four European languages: French, German, Italian and Polish. Semantic evidence as opposed to syntactic evidence in Section 3.1 is used to establish conclusively that the postverbal noun may only denote a body part.

In Section 3.5, the possibility of modification of the body part term is investigated and found to be proscribed and in the last section, the kind of body part permitted is shown to be restricted to those thought of as 'tangible' and 'highly functional'.

3.1 THE SYNTAX OF THE PASSIVE OF BODILY EFFECT

The passive of bodily effect is of this form:

NP <sub>P</sub>	BEI	NP <sub>P</sub>	V <sub>R</sub>	<u>LE</u>	N <sub>BP</sub>
(undergoer)		(agent)			(body part)
'WHOLE'					'PART'

1. Ta bei diren da-shang -le tui.

he BEI enemy hit:wound:COM leg

He was leg wounded through the enemy's firing.<sup>2</sup>

The reason why this construction is often called the 'bei passive with a retained object' is that when the active counterpart of this sentence is passivized, the body part term remains in its original position, following the verb and hence 'retained' in contrast to the noun denoting the person, the actual undergoer of the event, which is pulled out of the possessive NP and transposed to the head of the sentence as the new subject.<sup>3</sup> Compare (1) above with its active form (2) below and also with the regular passive form in (3) which may be generated from the basic S-V-O word order, when the whole possessive NP ta de tui 'his leg' is made into the new subject, the noun designating the body part not being 'left behind' in its original postverbal position:

---

2 The translations given for all the examples of the passives of bodily effect are literal rather than fluent in order to capture the notion of the body part term indicating the extent of the injury befalling the subject.

3 Dai baoliu binyu de beizi ju - "The bei passive with a retained object" is the name given to this construction by Lu Shu-xiang in "Notes on Language" (1965). Wang Li (1944, p.183) calls it liucun mudiyu 'retained object' too but discards this label as he believes that the Chinese construction does not resemble the English retained object at all.

Active S-V-O:

2.            Diren da-shang - le ta de tui.  
              enemy hit:wound:COM he GEN leg  
  
              The enemy wounded his leg.

Regular Passive with possessive NP as subject:

3.            Ta de tui bei diren da-shang - le.  
              he GEN leg BEI enemy hit:wound:COM  
  
              His leg was wounded through the enemy's firing.

Thus in (1), the passive of bodily effect separates the 'owner' from the body part by placing the former in the position of subject at the beginning of the sentence, while leaving the thing 'possessed' at the end of the sentence in its original position.

Bei sentences of this type where the subject denotes a person form the topic of this chapter. Two other kinds of bei sentence with a postverbal noun do exist however and should be mentioned here as they too, express a part-whole relationship. The first kind has an inanimate entity for its subject:

4.            Zhuozi bei ta nong-duan -le tui.  
              table BEI he do:break : COM leg  
  
              The table had one of its legs broken by him.
5.            Neike guoshu bei ta bo-qu - le shupi.  
              that:CL fruit:tree BEI he peel:off:COM bark  
  
              That tree had its bark ripped off by him.



Examples of this construction are rare. Consequently, it is difficult to ascertain if they are cases of personification or form a separate construction.<sup>4</sup>

The second kind of bei sentence forms a partitive passive and is more common. It may have either an inanimate or animate entity as its subject provided it is 'collective' in nature. In addition, the verb complement contains, not a postverbal noun, but a numeral and a noun classifier (or measure word) following the verb.

Lǚ Shuxiang also considers this to be one of the three kinds of "second object" which can be found in bei sentences. He states (1965:289) that:

A measure word as object restricts the quantity of the subject of bei ...  
There is the relation of either full or partial reference between them.

6. Sanlian jundui bei youjidui xiaomie - le lianglian.  
three:CL army BEI guerrilla annihilate : COM two:CL  
Two of the army's three companies were annihilated by the guerrillas.

This kind of bei sentence, similarly, does not come under discussion here.

Previous analyses of the 'retained object' construction may be broadly divided into two kinds: those taking a semantic approach such as Rajskaja (1958) and Guo Derun (1981) and those

---

4 It was extremely difficult to elicit examples of this construction from informants and in fact, I obtained more starred examples than acceptable ones.

taking a syntactic approach, for example, Lü Shuxiang (1965), Wang Huan (1957) and Wang Li (1944).<sup>5</sup>

Those linguists adopting a semantically oriented approach and even in some cases a purely syntactic approach in the analysis of this construction, agree that the retained object is 'related to' the undergoer, which is denoted by the subject, for example, Wang Li (1944:183) and the Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica (Zhongguo Kexueyuan Yuyansuo 1953:31).

Guo Derun goes one step further, describing this construction in the following way (1981:33):

[U]nder certain special conditions, the verb of the bei sentence may take an object, especially when the subject and the object are both undergoers... Some grammar books call the subject of this kind of sentence an 'indirect undergoer' and the object, the 'direct undergoer'. Between the direct and indirect undergoer there is a possessive relationship.

Guo uses the following sentence to exemplify these remarks (my numbering):

7. Ta wei le baohu jiti yangqun, bei caoyuan de  
she for:sake:of protect collective sheep: BEI plains REL  
flock

baofengxue dong-huai - le shuang shou.  
snowstorm freeze:damage : COM both hands

For the sake of the collective sheep flock, she was both hands frostbitten in the snowstorm on the plains.

Guo claims that ta 'she' and shuang shou 'both hands' are both undergoers of the verb dong-huai 'freeze:damage', since both NPs can serve as subjects of the regular passive:

---

5 Sandra A. Thompson in "Transitivity and some problems with the ba construction" (JCL 1:2) also examines the retained object construction but with reference to ba sentences and not to bei. Wang Huan (1957) and Lü Shuxiang (1965) consider the 'retained object' in both ba and bei sentences.

8.     ta   bei   dong-huai   -   le  
      she BEI freeze:damage : COM  
  
      She was frostbitten.

9.     shuang shou bei dong-huai - le.  
      both   hands BEI freeze:damage:COM  
  
      Both hands were frostbitten.

Guo's analysis needs to be refined: There is only one undergoer - the person denoted by the subject. The fact that the body part undergoes the same passive event can be explained in terms of the inalienable relationship, that is, the complete identification of the body part with the person. The body part does not constitute a second and separate undergoer.

Of even greater interest, is Rajskaja's classification of this kind of bei sentence into two groups on a semantic basis (1958:223-4): The first group consists of verbs of giving and taking which govern two objects, the direct object being retained in the passive predicate. The second group has an object in the predicate which she says represents an "inalienable possession". Rajskaja also states that this is "usually a part of the person".

In the following discussion of the syntax of this passive construction, I show to the contrary that verbs of giving and taking may be classified in with the regular passive on syntactic grounds. Secondly, I argue that inalienable possession is unconditionally conceptualized in terms of parts of the body by this construction.

Lü Shuxiang's article "Notes on Language" (1965) adopts the purely formal approach in analysis of this construction and so deserves attention in this section on the syntactic configuration of the passive of bodily effect.

Lü divides bei sentences with a retained object into five categories according to the syntactic properties they share, specifically according to the transformational possibilities between ba, bei and 'middle' sentences (active sentences with a passive meaning). The syntactic approach he uses is evident in the description he gives of the retained object passive (1965:289):

In passive constructions ... there is usually no object because the undergoer is already being used as the subject. ... However, an object occurring after the main verb ... is rather frequent ... The kind of object ... is either a noun, measure word or pronoun.

As a result, he classifies any passive with a noun following the verb to be a case of the 'retained object'. After sifting through the 53 examples he gives and groups into 5 categories, 18 of these proved to be cases of the predicate containing a verb-object compound and thus, denoting an action or activity as its overall meaning. That is, the retained object could not be thought of as being part of a larger entity affected by the passive event. In fact, the object in the V-0 compound was not even a concrete entity, one of the semantic conditions pertaining for the postverbal noun as we will see below. The V-0 compounds were all of the form:

VERB	+	OBJECT	VERB COMPOUND	MEANING
<u>kai</u>		'open'	<u>wanxiao</u>	'joke' = 'play a joke'
<u>fen</u>		'divide'	<u>lei</u>	'category' = 'classify'
<u>mian</u>		'discharge'	<u>zhi</u>	'duty' = 'fire'

Since such V-0 compounds denote an activity or action, examples involving them such as (10) below should be reclassified as belonging to the basic form of the bei passive and thus be considered as forming one of the regular kinds of predicates found to co-occur with it, in terms of the meaning they express. These

compound verbs have been discussed earlier in section 1.2 along with idiomatic expressions.

10.        Ta bei pengyou kai - le ge wanxiao.  
          he BEI friend open:COM CL joke  
          He had a joke played on him by his friends.

Similarly, idioms of the verb-object form found in the predicate of a passive cannot be regarded as an example of the retained object passive. The following examples show that the idiomatic meaning of this kind of V-O compound is equally bereft of any concrete entity which can be thought of as part of a larger entity, as far as the Chinese expressions are concerned.

<u>da</u>	'hit'	<u>erguang</u>	'earslap'	= 'box the ears'
<u>jiang</u>	'check'	<u>jun</u>	'army'	= 'put in check', 'embarrass'
<u>kou</u>	'cover'	<u>maozi</u>	'cap'	= 'put a label on someone'

Not only is the semantic evidence for discounting these predicates as forming examples of this construction convincing but also the syntactic evidence: Neither the O of the V-O compounds nor the O of the V-O idioms can be foregrounded into the subject position to form a possessive NP with the NP denoting the undergoer, unlike the case for parts of the body as shown above by example (3).

11.        \*Ta de wanxiao bei renjia kai - le.  
          he GEN joke BEI people open:COM

Example (11) shows that (10) cannot be transformed into the regular passive with a possessive NP as subject: \*"His joke was played on him by them".

Similarly:

12.        Ta bei baba da le erguang.  
          he BEI dad hit:COM earslap  
  
          He had his ears boxed by dad.
13.        \*Ta de erguang bei baba da -le.  
          he GEN earslap BEI dad hit:COM  
  
          (\*His slap was hit by dad.)
14.        Li Si bei renjia kou-shang-le fan geming de maozi.  
          (name) BEI people put:on : COM anti-revolutionary REL cap  
  
          Li Si was labelled as an anti-revolutionary by them.
15.        \*Li Si de fan geming maozi        bei renjia kou-shang le.  
          (name) GEN anti-revolutionary cap BEI people put:on COM  
  
          (\*Li Si's anti-revolutionary cap was put on by them.)

(N.B. The verb 'put on' with reference to hats and caps is dai and not kou-shang and only the latter may be used in this idiom.)

Thus passives composed of these predicates can be viewed as functioning syntactically in the same way as the regular passive and not as the 'retained object' passive.

Although half the examples gathered for these two kinds of predicates with V-O compounds are to be found in Lü's category C, which he points out contain several examples of a "strong idiomatic flavour" (1965:290), many are also found scattered throughout the other four groups. Since these 18 examples can be reclassified in with the regular form of the bei passive, let us now investigate the remaining examples closely to ascertain if, indeed at all, there are cases of the 'retained object' to be found among them, as I define it in terms of 'part' and 'whole', that is, apart of the body and the person.

Of the remaining 35 examples, four involve verbs of 'giving away' and have been discussed separately in section 1.1. Here it was shown that the recipient (Chu's Benefactive Case) of a verb of giving may occur postverbally in the regular passive as in (17) but never in the subject position as (16) demonstrates since the recipient as subject is not appropriate in an adversity passive.

16.        \*Mali bei ta gei -le liangben shu le.  
          (name) BEI he give:COM two:CL book INC  
  
          (\*Mary was given two books by him.)

17.        Wo liangben shu bei ta gei -le Mali le.  
          my two:CL book BEI he give:COM (name) INC  
  
          Two of my books were given (away) to Mary by him.

As only the owner of the object to be transferred may occur as (part of) the subject, a postverbal 'recipient' NP as in (17) cannot be moved into this position unless it is interpreted anew as an 'owner'. This is clear from the fact that a new recipient NP must follow the verb gei 'give' as well or else the sentence is ungrammatical. Compare (18) with (19), where (18) lacks the postverbal NP denoting the recipient:

18.        \*Mali de liangben shu bei ta gei - le.  
          (name) GEN two:CL book BEI he give:COM  
  
          (\*Mary's two books were given by him.)

19.        Mali de liangben shu bei ta gei - le pengyou le.  
          (name) GEN two:CL book BEI he give:COM friend INC  
  
          Two of Mary's books were given (away) by him to friends.

These sentences may therefore be considered as belonging to the basic form of the passive as well.

A further 11 examples in Lü's analysis which seem to have a 'retained object' in fact, involve a noun which expresses the resulting state of the undergoer and neither a part of nor a possession belonging to the undergoer. These should also be reclassified in with the regular bei passive, since this kind of noun serves the purpose of fulfilling the semantic restriction of encoding completiveness by specifying a change of state, a feature that was discussed in section 1.3 above. Examples (20) and (21) contain a postverbal NP expressing a resulting state:

20. Gu Daniang de liangge gang-li bei ta guan-man -le shui.  
grandma GEN two:CL urn:in BEI he pour:full:COM water

Grandma Gu's two urns were filled with water by him.

21. Zhei kuai di bei shizheng fen-cheng-le san xiao kuai.  
this piece land BEI council divide:into:COM three little pieces

This piece of land was divided into 3 small ones by the city council.

The syntactic evidence is decisive here as well, since neither can this kind of bei construction be transformed into the regular passive by transposing the final noun phrase to the head of the sentence to make a possessive NP: Compare (20) with (22) and (21) with (23) respectively:

22. \*Liangge gang-li de shui bei ta guan-man-le.  
two:CL urn:in REL water BEI he pour:full:COM

(Two urns of water were poured full by him.)



23. \*Zhei kuai di de san xiao kuai bei shizheng fen-cheng-le.  
this piece land REL 3 small piece BEI council divide:into:COM

(The 3 small pieces of this land were divided up by the city council.)

Consider two final examples:

24. Yuchi-li bei ren reng-jin-le yangyou.  
pond:in BEI sb throw:in:COM kerosene

The fishpond had kerosene thrown into it by people.

25. \*Yuchi-li de yangyou bei ren reng-jin-le.  
pond:in REL kerosene BEI sb thrown:in:COM

(\*The fishpond's kerosene was thrown in by people.)

In example (25) with a possessor-possessed NP as subject, even if we replace 'kerosene' with 'fishfood', the sentence remains unacceptable.

26. \*Yuchi-li de yushi bei ren reng-jin-le.  
pond:in REL fishfood BEI sb throw:in:COM

(\*The pond's fishfood was thrown in by people.)

Examples (25) and (26) are interpreted to mean that the 'kerosene' or 'fishfood' is already in the pond, producing a semantic clash when the predicate following the passive marker re-iterates the event of the kerosene or fishfood being thrown into the pond. A new event needs to be indicated by the verb that will show some change of state resulting for the subject, such as in (27):

27. Yuchi-li de yushi bei hama chi-diao-le.  
pond:in REL food BEI toad eat:away:COM

The food in the fishpond was eaten up by toads.

Hence, the subject must indicate the pre-change of state entity in bei passives and not the entity in its resultant state of affairs. To satisfy this semantic requirement, the predicate needs to refer to an event distinct from any that could be inferred from the NP denoting the subject.

It is clear that the examples above with a postverbal noun denoting a resultant state cannot be regarded as having a retained object from both syntactic and semantic points of view. Firstly, none is able to undergo the syntactic test of transposing the postverbal noun into subject position to form a possessive NP. Only the passive of bodily effect which expresses a part-whole relationship has a corresponding regular passive of this type - with a possessive NP as subject.

Secondly, the postverbal NP in examples (20), (21) and (24) is not semantically related to the undergoer as its part. Consequently, such examples will be considered to belong to the regular passive.

Lü's remaining 20 examples genuinely belong to either the passive of bodily effect or the partitive passive. This is verified by the fact that they may be "converted" into the regular passive which we have shown is impossible for predicate NPs which do not denote parts of the body.

3.2 THE SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIATION OF THE PASSIVE  
OF BODILY EFFECT FROM THE REGULAR PASSIVE

The passive of bodily effect conceptualizes the passive event in a different way to that of the regular passive: Let us consider the semantics of (28) and (29) in which both these constructions are exemplified:

Passive of Bodily Effect:

28. Ta bei diren da-shang -le tui.  
he BEI enemy hit:wounded:COM leg  
He was leg wounded through the enemy's firing.

Regular Passive:

29. Ta de tui bei diren da-shang -le.  
he GEN leg BEI enemy hit:wounded:COM  
His leg was wounded through the enemy's firing.

The implication of (29), the regular passive, is that only the subject's leg was aimed for, hit and wounded, whereas in (28), the subject's whole body was beaten up (or indiscriminately shot at), with the outcome of one of his legs specifically being injured. (Note that the verb da may mean either 'beat' or 'fire [a gun]').

Thus, in the passive of bodily effect, the main verb of transitive action da 'hit' refers to an event involving the whole person and the second verb which is a resultative complement verb of state shang 'wounded' refers consistently to the resulting state of the given part of the body. We could paraphrase it in this way: "He was beaten up so that his leg became wounded."

Since this passive construction expresses the inalienableness or "identity" of the given part of the body with the person, the combined semantic effect of the stative verb and the noun designating this body part is to refer to some lasting effect on the subject who is also the undergoer.

The semantic constraint requiring that the passives of inalienable relationship encode lasting effect (i.e. a change of state) for the undergoer is another feature which distinguishes it from the regular passive. The regular passive only needs to encode the completed nature of the event (1.3).

Evidence for this semantic characterisation of the passive of bodily effect lies in the unacceptability of this syntactic construction if there is no specification of the resultant state of the body part in question - when only the action is specified. Example (28) would be ungrammatical if the second verb shang 'wounded' were removed, while example (29) could be shortened in this way and remain perfectly acceptable. The same case applies for (30) as opposed to (31):

30.           \*Ta bei Li Si da-le bizi yi-quan.  
          he BEI (name) hit:COM nose one:CL  
  
          (He had his nose given a punch by Li Si.)
31.           Ta de bizi bei Li Si da-le yi-quan.  
          he GEN nose BEI (name) hit:COM one:CL  
  
          His nose was given a punch by Li Si.

Example (30) is unacceptable due to the confusion over interpreting whether it was 'he' who has been punched (without specifying where on the body) or 'his nose', and so a kind of semantic contest arises between 'he' and 'nose' as to which one will gain interpretation as

the undergoer. Thus, the body part term 'nose' in this example acts as a second object and not as part of the verb complement following the resultative verb as did tui 'leg' in (28) above.

This semantic feature is also syntactically manifested in the requirement at this level of a resultative verb compound in the predicate. All the acceptable examples of the passive of bodily effect in this chapter contain these verb compounds made up of two verb constituents, the first one denoting an action and the second, the state resulting from the action, for example, la-kai 'pull open' and xi-ganjing 'wash clean'.<sup>6</sup>

Similarly, if the main verb refers to an action specifically affecting the body part and not the person as a whole, then only the basic form of the bei passive may be used with a possessive NP as subject, since this means that the verb compound refers as a whole exclusively to the body part:

32.       \*Ta bei jiqi       zhen-huai - le erduo.  
          he BEI machine vibrate:damage:COM ear

(He had his ears hurt through the vibrating of the machinery.)

33.       Ta de erduo bei zhen-huai - le.  
          he GEN ear   BEI vibrate:damage:COM

His ears were hurt through the vibrating of the machinery.

Here it is not the person who is being caused to vibrate all over until a part of his body - his ears - suffer injury. Only

---

6 For a detailed description and analysis of resultative verb compounds, see Sandra A. Thompson, (1973), "Resultative Verb Compounds in Mandarin Chinese: A Case for Lexical Rules" in Language 49.

the part of the body itself is understood to undergo the event. More syntactic evidence of this lies in the fact that in Chinese one can't say:

34.        \*Ta bei jiqi zhen-le.  
          he BEI machine vibrate:COM  
  
          (He was caused to vibrate by the machinery.)

as opposed to:

35.        Zhen-le ermo.  
          vibrate:COM eardrum  
  
          (It) vibrated the eardrums.

Similarly, if only one's voice is specifically affected by an event, then "voice" is being thought of as the undergoer and not the person as a whole, so that the former must be placed in subject position in order to form a regular passive, as in (37). The passive of bodily effect in (36) is unacceptable:

36.        \*Ta bei jiqi        de zaoyin yan-mo-le shengyin.  
          he BEI machine REL noise   drown:COM voice  
  
          (He had his voice drowned out by the noise of the machinery.)

37.        Ta de shengyin bei jiqi        de zaoyin yan-mo-le.  
          he GEN voice     BEI machine REL noise   drown:COM  
  
          His voice was drowned out by the noise of the machinery.

Idioms give striking evidence of the difference in meaning between the two kinds of bei passive. When it is possible to split idioms of the V-0 form apart which involve a body part term, the latter become part of the new subject of a regular passive

and the meaning changes to a literal interpretation with the consequent loss of the idiomatic meaning. Consider the idiom jiu-zhu bianzi in (38) which means 'seize upon somebody's shortcomings':

38.        Ta bei ren jiu-zhu-le bianzi.  
          he BEI sb grab:hold:COM pigtail  
  
          He had his shortcomings seized upon by people.

(n.b. Example (38) would have originally been a "body part" passive with the meaning "He was pigtail grabbed hold of by people" which has undergone semantic change, producing the idiomatic meaning.)

When the idiom is split apart in the formation of the regular passive, exemplified by (39), it reverts to its literal meaning:

39.        Ta de bianzi bei ren jiu-zhu-le.  
          he GEN pigtail BEI sb grab:hold:COM  
  
          His pigtail was grabbed hold of by people.

That the 'retained object' passive lends itself to the use of such idioms, but not the regular passive, gives weight to the syntactic analysis of the 'retained object' or postverbal noun as being part of a complex predicate which expresses the extent and kind of harm inflicted upon a person in terms of a part of the body.

Therefore, in the passive of bodily effect, the constraint on the predicate requiring a syntactic form that will express a change of state semantically is a stringent requirement as opposed to the case for the regular passive, where it is absent.

Consequently, this passive must be used with resultative verb compounds as well as with the aspect marker -le in order to

encode the completed nature of the event which results in this change of state.

Example (40) is used to show how passive sentences belonging to this construction become unacceptable once the completive aspect marker is removed. Compare (40) with (28) above:

40.        \*Ta bei diren da-shang tui.  
          he BEI enemy hit:wound leg

In this section, the passive of bodily effect has been syntactically and semantically differentiated from the regular passive. The passive of bodily effect is distinguished by the syntactic features of a postverbal noun denoting a body part and the requirement of a resultative verb compound. On the semantic level, it is distinguished from the regular passive by encoding not only that the undergoer is adversely affected but more specifically that the undergoer is adversely affected by the state of affairs which comes about for a part of the body.

Since the meaning grammaticalized by each construction is distinct, separate semantic structures must be postulated for them. They cannot be freely 'transformed' one into the other. The semantic representation proposed for the passive of bodily effect is as follows:



PASSIVE OF BODILY EFFECT

Syntactic Schema:

NP <sub>P</sub>	BEI	NP <sub>P</sub>	V <sub>R</sub>	<u>LE</u>	N <sub>BP</sub>
Undergoer		Agent			Part of the Body

Example

Ta bei diren da-shang - le tui.

he BEI enemy hit:wound:COM leg

Person A

Person B

Body Part Z

He was leg wounded through the enemy's firing.

Thinking of this person (A)

I say:

Something happened to person A (event Y)

because person B did something to A

a body part Z came to be in a certain state

because of this

(Z can be thought of as part of person A's body

I don't need to say any more about body part Z

Person A became unable to do something

because of this.

I am thinking of Y as something that was bad for A.

The justification for the postulation of each component in the semantic representation is carried out in the sections which follow.

### 3.3 SEMANTIC FIELD OF THE POSTVERBAL NOUN

In this section I will examine from which semantic categories the postverbal noun may be selected for the passive of bodily effect. Conclusive evidence will be given to show that only nouns designating parts of the body are acceptable.

Special constructions expressing 'inalienable' relationship are a well-known phenomenon to both linguists and anthropologists (c.f. Sapir's 1917 article). Nonetheless, 'inalienable' is only a cover term for a number of different though related semantic categories, the referents of which cannot be taken for granted. What exactly then is characterized as 'inalienable' by this particular Chinese construction and over how many semantic fields can it be applied?

Charles Bally in his article "L'expression des idées de sphère personnelle et de solidarité dans les langues indo-européennes" provides an extensive list of semantic categories which may be potentially regarded as 'inalienable' through their expression in these special constructions (1926:69):

(The personal domain) ... includes generally the body, its parts, sometimes its dimensions, the soul of the individual, and in certain cases the voice, the name. It may also include to a differing degree, everything which holds an habitual relationship to it: clothing, familiar objects, utensils etc, associated persons, family, servants, friends and in each of these sub-categories there is further opportunity for delicate distinctions. (My translation)

Bally shows that for several Indo-European languages, the use of the dative of personal pronouns in conjunction with the definite article (determining the noun designating the 'inalienable' entity,) is a common means of expression of this special relation-

ship, in contrast to the use of the possessive pronoun and no dative personal pronoun. These two kinds of constructions exist side by side in French, which is of course, his main reference language. Compare (41) with (42):

Dative construction with the definite article:

41.        Je me lave les mains (\*sales).  
          I to me wash the hands (\*dirty)  
  
          I wash my hands for myself.

Possessive pronoun with body part term:

42.        Je lave mes mains sales.    cf. Je lave mes vêtements sales.  
          I wash my hands dirty            I wash my clothes dirty  
  
          I wash my dirty hands.            I wash my dirty clothes.

Sentence (41) exemplifies one of the reflexive-type constructions that employ the dative in opposition to the use of the genitive, exemplified by (42).

Let us now ascertain precisely which of these semantic categories are permissible in the Chinese construction, comparing it with the corresponding dative constructions in several European languages, namely French, German, Italian and Polish.

3.3.1        Kinship:

Kinship is excluded from this passive construction in Chinese. However, in the literature on this topic, one such example was uncovered. (Wang Huan 1957:38, her example (27).)

43.        Ni gei dizhu hai-si die, wo gei dizhu hai-si niang.  
          you GEI landowner kill father, I GEI landowner kill mother  
  
          You were father killed by the landowner, I was mother  
          killed by the landowner. [i.e. You had your father  
          killed on you by the landowner, and I, my mother.]

Apparently, this is no longer acceptable in colloquial Chinese. The regular S-V-O construction of (44) must be used, or the basic passive form as in (45):

44. Dizhu hai-si - le ni de die.  
landowner harm:die:COM you GEN father  
The landowner killed your father.

45. Ni de die gei dizhu hai-si - le.  
you GEN father GEI landowner harm:die:COM  
Your father was killed by the landowner.

Similarly, example (46) is unacceptable with 'child' placed in postverbal position:

46. \*Ta bei lang chi-diao-le haizi.  
she BEI wolf eat:up:COM child  
(= She had her child eaten by a wolf.)

As one would expect from the unacceptability of (46), the kinship category cannot be extended to include pet animals:

47. \*Wo bei gou yao-si - le mao.  
I BEI dog bite:die:COM cat  
(= I had my cat killed by a dog.)

To the contrary, in European languages, kinship may be freely encoded in these dative constructions, although it is not a construction exclusively encoding this category as an inalienable relationship.

48. French: Ils lui ont tué le (\*son) père.  
they to him have killed the (\*his) father

49. German: Sie haben ihm den (seinen) Vater getötet.  
they have to him the (his) father killed
50. Italian: Gli hanno ucciso il (\*suo) padre.  
to him have killed the (\*his) father
51. Polish: Zabili mu ojca.  
they:kill to him father

In French and German, when the dative pronoun is deleted to form neutral constructions, the definite article is typically replaced by a possessive pronoun in complete (non-coordinate) sentences. Retention of the definite article would be understood contrastively, if part of a complex sentence or to mean "religious father" rather than "real father" for a complete utterance.

52. Ils ont tué son (le) père.  
they have killed his (the) father
53. Sie haben seinen (den) Vater getötet.  
they have his (the) father killed

The main difference in meaning is that the dative constructions exemplified by (48) and (49), carry the implication that the son was specifically affected by this event, which is not the case for the neutral S-V-O constructions exemplified by (52) and (53).

For the semantic category of kinship, German can use either the possessive pronoun or the definite article in conjunction with the dative pronoun, whereas French and Italian use only the definite article for the non-alienable entity, as in (48) and (50) and the possessive article only when the dative pronoun is not present in the neutral non-affective construction as in (52) and

(54).<sup>7</sup> (Note that the dative construction is the preferred form in Italian.)

54.        Hanno ucciso suo (il) padre.  
          have killed his (the) father  
  
          They killed his father.

In Chinese, there is a special 'affective' construction for kinship, different to this passive construction, where no agent is stated and the subject refers to the affected person. It takes the form NP<sub>p</sub> V NP<sub>p</sub> where the second NP denotes a person related by kin to the first NP and subject.

55.        ta si-le muqin.  
          he die:COM mother  
  
          As for him, his mother is dead.

Some European languages also have similar one-argument non-agentive constructions that place the affected person in the dative case obligatorily. French cannot use this construction however.

56.    French:        \*La mère m'est morte.  
                          the mother to me is dead
57.        Ma mère est morte.  
                          my mother is dead
58.    German:        Ihm ist die Mutter gestorben.  
                          to him has the mother died

---

7 See Wierzbicka (1979a:315-17) for more discussion on the variety of dative constructions in French with and without the definite article.

I would like to thank the following people who were consulted on the European data: Martine Raibaud, Maryse Equuy and Mrs J. Mayrhofer (French); Andrea Pohlmann, Klaus Ecker and Karl Rensch (German); Anna Ravanno and Francesco Consentino (Italian) and Anna Wierzbicka (Polish).

59. Seine Mutter ist gestorben.  
his mother has died
60. Italian: Gli è morta la madre.  
to him has died the mother
61. E' morta sua madre.  
has died his mother
62. Polish: Matka mi umarła.  
mother to me dead
63. Moja matka umarła.  
my mother died

The above constructions from these four particular European languages (32) to (35) may be extended to possessions as well, that is, they are not special constructions expressing how a person is affected by something happening to their kin. The realm of 'inalienable' entities does, in fact, extend to belongings for the two-place argument dative constructions exemplified by (64) to (67).

64. French: Ils lui ont brulé sa maison.  
they to him have burnt his house
65. German: Sie haben ihm das Haus angezündet.  
they have to him the house set: on: fire
66. Italian: Gli è bruciata la casa.  
to him is burnt the house
67. Polish: Dom mu się spalił.  
house to him itself burn

This is not the case in other language families such as American Indian languages where special constructions are to be found which differentiate inalienable kinship from material possessions by means of special affixes: Edward Sapir points out in his review of an article by C.C. Uhlenbeck that in Iroquois, personal relations are expressed as transitive verbs (1917-1920:887):

[T]hus, one cannot say MY GRANDFATHER or MY GRANDSON... but (Iroquois) uses formal transitives which may be respectively translated as HE GRANDFATHERS ME or I GRANDFATHER HIM.

The 'delicate distinctions' that Bally claims may be found within each semantic category (with the classification as 'inalienable' depending on the particular language) are clearly exhibited by many of these American languages: Body part terms and kinship terms may either be classed together morphologically or given separate sets of possessive affixes. This is the case for Chimariko as opposed to Sioux and Haida. In Nootka, body part terms are marked by the passive affix, expressive of the identity of the body part with the person with the result that body parts, in their not being physically separable from the person are viewed differently from possessions. Nootka reflects this fact in its morphology by encoding this class of nouns as 'inert elements' (1917-1920:87).

The semantic field of personal relationships may be further subdivided into 'non-controllable' kinship - blood relationships such as mother and uncle - as opposed to relationships which may be regarded as exclusive, depending on the particular culture associated with the language. These include the relational terms 'husband', 'wife', 'sweetheart' and 'friend'. Nootka and Takelma treat these two subsets differently in their morphology.



Interestingly enough, 'sweetheart' and 'friend' are classified in with the kinship terms in these two languages, whereas 'husband' and 'wife' are not (1917-1920:88).

Sapir's Iroquois example displays the fine distinction between syntax and morphology, as well as highlighting the fact that in some languages, kinship may be specially singled out by the morphology or syntax as opposed to other noun classes, inalienable or alienable as they may be.

In Chinese, kinship and body part terms in possessive expressions that are non-bound are grouped together as opposed to other kinds of possessive relationships. This is demonstrated by the possibility of deletion of the possessive marker de:

Kinship:            Ta de mama / Ta mama            Her mother

Exclusive relation:

Ta de zhangfu / Ta zhangfu            Her husband

Other personal relationships:

Ta de duixiang / \*Ta duixiang            Her sweetheart

Ta de pengyou / \*Ta pengyou            Her friend

Body part:

Ta de bizi / \*Ta bizi            Her nose

Animate possession: (e.g. pets)

Ta de xiao mao / \*Ta xiao mao            Her kitten

Inanimate possession:

Ta de shu / \*Ta shu            Her book

In contrast to the situation for possessive NPs, an even more restricted subset is all that is permissible in the passive of bodily effect. Not only is the kinship category excluded, but also all kinds of material possessions:

### 3.3.2 Material Possessions

#### (a) Clothes being worn on the body:

The dative constructions in these four European languages also have the potential to treat an event that involves clothing being worn on the body as affecting the person who is wearing them. If this is the case, then the clothes can be thought of as 'being not separable from the person'. This identification occurs in English syntax too where sentence (68) is acceptable but neither (69) or (70) are:

68. I saw Tim with his dog/umbrella/bicycle.  
69. \*I saw Tim with his clothes.  
70. \*I saw Tim and his clothes.<sup>8</sup>

Such an identification of clothing and the wearer is certainly made by the dative constructions in these four European languages, and also for owners and their possessions as we will see below.<sup>9</sup>

---

8 Examples (69) and (70) are starred for the interpretation that Tim was wearing these clothes at the moment when I saw him.

9 Note that in French there are different degrees of identification encoded by the various dative constructions depending on whether or not the object affected is a body part or a possession. Material possessions such as jupe 'skirt' in (71) and chapeau 'hat' in (72) must be qualified by the possessive pronoun and never by the definite article. Body part terms may be qualified by either depending on which dative construction is selected by the speaker. For example, adjectival modification of the body part term combines only with the possessive pronoun:

Marie lui a lavé ses (\*les) mains sales  
(name) to:him has washed his (\*the) hands dirty

Mary washed his dirty hands for him.

71. French: Il lui a déchiré sa jupe. (\*la jupe)  
he to:her has torn her skirt
72. Il lui a fait tomber son chapeau. (\*le chapeau)  
he to:her has made fall her hat
73. German: Er hat ihr den Rock zer<sup>r</sup>issen.  
he has to:her the skirt ^ torn
74. Sie hat ihm den Hut vom Kopf geschlagen.  
she has to:him the hat from head hit:off
75. Italian: Pietro le ha strappato la gonna.  
to:her has torn the skirt
76. Pietro le ha tolto il cappello.  
to:her has hit the hat
77. Polish: Podarł Hance sukienkę.  
he:tore to:Anna dress
78. Stracił Hance kapelusz z głowy.  
he:knock to:Anna hat from head

Do we have the corresponding examples to 'She had her skirt torn (on her) by him' and 'She had her hat knocked off (her head) by him' in Chinese? If these two expressions are translated by means of the passive of bodily effect, comprehensible although substandard sentences are the end-product: It is more orthodox to use the regular passive in both these cases:

79. ??Ta bei Zhang San che-po - le qunzi.  
she BEI (name) tear:break:COM skirt  
? She was skirt torn by Zhang San.

80.           ? Xiao Mei bei ta da-diao-le maozi.  
              (name)   BEI he hit:off:COM cap  
  
              ? Xiao Mei was cap knocked off by him.

The awkwardness of the two examples (79) and (80) is once again eliminated by changing them into the regular passive construction with a possessive noun phrase as the subject:

81.           Ta de qunzi bei Zhang San che-po - le.  
              she GEN skirt BEI   (name) tear:break:COM  
  
              Her skirt was torn by Zhang San.

82.           Ta de maozi bei Zhang San da-diao-le.  
              she GEN cap   BEI   (name) hit:off:COM  
  
              Her cap was knocked off by Zhang San.

(b) Other possessions:

Can a person be affected by an event which involves their belongings - a real possession with which there is no prolonged physical contact (as with clothing) and thus is ordinarily thought of as separate from the person and that person's body? In fact, German widely uses dative constructions to link a person with their possessions: Examples (83) and (84) exemplify two kinds of dative constructions in German and (85) the neutral counterpart of (84).

83.           Ihm ist ein Baum aufs Auto gefallen.  
              to:him has a tree on the car    fallen
84.           Johann nahm ihm sein Buch fort.  
              (name) took to:him his book   away
85.           Johann nahm sein Buch fort.  
              (name) took his book away

So does Italian and French, exemplified by (86) and (87) respectively:

86. Pietro mi ha preso il libro.  
(name) to:me has taken the book

87. Pierre m'a pris le livre des mains.  
(name) to:me:has taken the book from:the hands

There are literary examples to be found in Chinese of this construction with a postverbal noun designating an inanimate entity. They all prove to be unacceptable in modern colloquial Chinese, however, such as this one given by Wang Li in Theory of Chinese Grammar (1944:183):

88. Ta bei ta de lao mazi tou - le xuduo dongxi.<sup>10</sup>  
he BEI he GEN amah steal:COM many things  
He was many things stolen by his amah.

With regard to Wang Li's example, we find that even if such an example is acceptable in literary Chinese, it, too, can no longer be used in colloquial Chinese where a possessive NP must be made into the subject:

89. Ta de xuduo dongxi bei ta de lao mazi tou - le.  
he GEN many things BEI he GEN amah steal:COM  
Many of his things were stolen by his amah.

Guo Derun (1981:32) claims that such sentences are a matter of incorrect usage even in the written language. With respect to this claim, he discusses two examples of a bei sentence

---

10 Note that this example, (88), is given as acceptable by Wang Li.

where the postverbal noun does not denote a part of the body (his numbering):

- (29) \*Jishi zai zuowan kanxi de shihou,  
even:if at yesterday: watch: REL time  
  evening play

ye bei ta faxian - le diqing.

also BEI he discover:COM enemy:situation

(Even while watching the play yesterday evening, the enemy's situation was discovered by him.)

- (30) \*Jinnian chunji yundong hui shang,  
this:year spring athletics meeting -at  
bei ta dapo - le sanxiang quanguo jilu.  
BEI he break:COM three:CL national record

(At the athletics meeting in spring this year, three national records were broken by him.)

These two sentences have both had bei added to the beginning of a sentence with the agent as subject ... with the result that both clearly lack a subject and are very awkward to read.

Guo concludes that it is better to delete the superfluous bei and use an active form sentence in these cases.

In reference to example (88), we find another comment about undergoers: Wang Li asserts that in this "special passive form", "many things" is the true undergoer and "he", although it is the subject, only represents "the person related to the undergoer". He continues with the following statement (1944:183):

To generalize, this kind of subject doesn't represent the undergoer but rather its owner. This allows the passive form to keep its object position. It is a flexible usage of the passive.

As is already apparent from the preceding discussion, I would dispute such a syntactic and semantic characterization of the

passive of bodily effect as being merely a flexible usage of the passive. For a start, it serves the different semantic function of being an identifying expression, expressing the inseparability of a certain part of the body from the person denoted by the subject. Furthermore, this construction encodes that whatever happens to the part of the body in question has consequences of a lasting nature for the person. Thus, in contradistinction to Wang Li's analysis, the subject must be regarded as the undergoer and not the postverbal noun denoting the body part. In this point, my analysis agrees with that of Wang Huan who states with regard to examples (43) and (45) above that it is always the subject who is the undergoer of the event (1957:184).

Hence, this construction proves to be much more limited in its semantic scope than the corresponding dative expressions in some of the European languages: Consider a final example with a postverbal noun denoting a possession:

90.            \*Fangdong lao taitai bei tamen qiangzhan-le fangzi.  
                  landlady                    BEI they        occupy :COM house  
                  (The landlady had her house occupied on her by them.)

### 3.3.3        Name, Soul and Emotions

Let us consider two last semantic fields that Bally lists as potential categories that may be encoded in identifying expressions: 'name' and 'soul'. Are there constructions which encode the association of a person's name or soul with the actual person themselves?

According to Bally, 'soul' may be utilised in one of the dative constructions in French:

91.            se torturer l'esprit<sup>11</sup>  
              (Dat) torment    the spirit

He claims (1926:77) that Modern French "restricts the domain of the subjective self to the body and the soul, excluding those in one's social entourage and other things...."

In Chinese, neither of these categories is possible. Given the semantic restrictions that an adversative and agentive event must be encoded, it is difficult to find any examples for 'name' at all. Possible adversative events involving a person's name such as 'forget one's own name': wang le ziji de mingzi, or in the broader sense where name means 'reputation', as in 'lose one's own good name' and we have the expression diu lian: 'lose face', all prove to be one-argument intransitive events and thus not appropriate for this construction. A two-argument predicate such as 'save someone's reputation' is also inappropriate, not only because it is a beneficial event but also for the reason which brings us to the next major semantic restriction on the postverbal noun in the passive of bodily effect: It must refer to a concrete and tangible entity. All abstract concepts are thus excluded. This constraint will become more apparent in Section 3.6 detailing kinds of body parts which may be encoded in this construction. Thus, abstract concepts such as 'name' and 'soul' are excluded and this constraint extends to the semantic field of emotions as well: Compare the acceptability of the passive of bodily effect in (92) with the regular passive in (93) and for the following two pairs of (94) and (95) and (96) and (97):

---

11    The use of the definite article here is contrary to expectation since it is not permitted with clothing terms in the French dative constructions.



92.        \*Ta bei pengyou zheng-huilai-le mianzi.  
          she BEI friend retrieve     :COM face
93.        Pengyou ti ta zheng-huilai-le mianzi.  
          friend for she retrieve :COM face  
  
          Her friends saved her reputation.
94.        \*Ta bei shangdi zhengjiu-le linghun.  
          he BEI God           save     :COM soul
95.        Shangdi zhengjiu-le ta de linghun.  
          God           save :COM he GEN soul  
  
          God saved his soul.
96.        \*Xiao Mei bei ta jiqi -le aiqing/lianmin.  
          (name) BEI he stir up:COM love/compassion
97.        Xiao Mei dui ta chansheng -le aiqing/lianmin.  
          (name) to him produce :COM love/compassion  
  
          Xiao Mei started to feel love (compassion) for him.

This section has shown that only body part terms may be encoded by the postverbal noun in the 'retained object' construction with a person as the subject in contradistinction to other semantic fields such as kinship, clothing being worn on the body, possessions, the soul, the name and emotions.

Hence, it is a special construction encoding events which happen to the body. To be specific: how a person is affected in a lasting and adversative manner by an event involving a part of the body. That an identifying expression of this nature is encoded syntactically by means of a passive construction is not remarkable either, given the exclusive relationship between a person and their body parts: ('My arm' belongs to me and to nobody else in contrast

to 'my father' who may also be my siblings' father, or 'my car' which others can use or borrow and which is physically separate from me as are my kin.) Secondly, with regard to American Indian languages, Sapir notes Uhlenbeck's conclusion that when "the possessive pronouns are related to the pronominal affixes of the verb, they agree in form, not with the subjective or energetic, but on the whole, with the objective or casus inertiae" (1917-20:89). In Nootka, there is a special suffix for body parts indicating inseparability, preceding the general possessive suffix and it is identical to the passive suffix on verbs (1917-20:87). It appears that what applies for the case of morphology in certain American languages is reflected syntactically in Chinese through the linking of the person and their body parts in this special passive construction.

We note also that for the dative expressions in the four European languages, the scope of use is more extensive and the semantic restrictions correspondingly fewer. The 'milder' effect possible on the person (designated morphologically by the dative case) compared to what is always a lasting effect encoded in the Chinese construction must be seen as a consequence thereof. - The dative constructions generally express that the person feels something as a result of a certain event rather than their undergoing some change of state as is the case in Chinese.<sup>12</sup>

If it is semantically natural to link a person and their body parts in a passive construction while excluding other semantic categories as I claim, then it is interesting to note that the

---

12 See Wierzbicka (1979a:343-350) for an analysis of the experiencer-type constructions in English and German.

converse does not hold: In English and Chinese, there are no special constructions encoding an agent (a person in the agentive case) and how they cause an event to happen to some other entity by means of an active part of the body. It is indisputable that instrumental clauses may be added to actor-action constructions, but this does not signify a special construction, rather only further specification of how an event is caused. Moreover, when a body part is an instrument, in English one must express the possessive relationship. We cannot say:

98. \*I hit Jim with  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} a \\ the \end{array} \right\}$  hand.

but only

99. I hit Jim with my hand.

in contrast to

100. I hit Jim with  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} a \\ the \\ my \end{array} \right\}$  stick.

Similarly:

101. \*My leg kicked him.

102. ?I kicked him with my leg. (n.b. "I kicked him with my right leg" is, however, acceptable.)

103. \*I caused my leg to kick him.

104. \*My hand punched him.

105. ?I punched him with my fist.

(Again, an example such as "I punched him with my right fist, then my left" is acceptable, with the use of the instrumental clause to introduce the contrastive adjective.)

106. \*I made my hand punch him.

There appear to be no special constructions in English or Chinese which syntactically separate the agent from the body part used as an instrument in the action, while semantically identifying these two entities to the effect that "What is done by the body part to something else is thought of as what is done by the person". This would be the converse of the meaning expressed by the dative constructions in European languages and the Chinese passive of bodily effect: "What happens to the body part is thought of as happening to the person as a whole." The reason for the absence of such constructions is, of course, quite obvious: A body part used as an instrument to carry out some action cannot be thought of as separate from the person - the agent who wills and controls the action and then be re-identified with it. When a certain (active) part of the body moves, it is what the person is doing, one and the same action. On the other hand, for 'body part' constructions, there are two ways of treating it: Either the body part is expressed as a separate entity, to be regarded in the same way as any other object, or else it may be expressed as inseparable from the person. Both these kinds of constructions can be found in English, exemplified by (109) and (110) as opposed to (107) and (108) respectively:

107. She kissed him on the lips.      0 = person

108. ?She kissed the table on the legs.      0 = inanimate object

109. She kissed his lips.

O = inanimate

110. She kissed the photograph.

The affective constructions in (107) and (108) require a personal NP as their direct object, demonstrated by the infelicity of (108). Neither could we say "She kissed his photograph on the lips", yet an ~~inanimate~~ <sup>is</sup> D.O. <sup>is</sup> acceptable for the neutral S-V-O construction exemplified by (109) and (110) where any kind of object NP is permitted: "She kissed his photograph"/"She kissed his lips"/"She kissed him." Why is a sentient entity required as the direct object in the affective English construction where the relevant body part follows in a prepositional phrase? Presumably this is closely tied to the component of meaning which states that the undergoer "feels something" as a result of the agent's action, and explains why such a proposition as "Mary kicked the car on the tyres" is not to be found.<sup>13</sup>

The fact that parts of the body are singled out in Chinese for special treatment is therefore indicative of their being viewed as the most inalienable of possessions.

By comparison, an event involving a related person or possession is only considered to have at best an indirect effect on the subject, since such categories are excluded from the construction.

If the postverbal noun denoting the body part were the undergoer, as Wang Li claims, then how could it be placed away from

---

13. The reader is referred to a detailed analysis of this English construction in Anna Wierzbicka's article "Ethno-Syntax and the Philosophy of Grammar" (1979a:343-6).

the subject position? The 'retained object' passive incorporates the body part term as part of a complex predicate because it is so central to the change and enduring adversative effect felt by the undergoer who is denoted by the subject. The body part is thus not understood as the undergoer unless it is placed in subject position and forms a regular passive.<sup>14</sup>

In this section, I have shown conclusively that only parts of the body may be denoted by the postverbal noun. In the following section, the kind of event encoded by this passive construction is discussed with continuing reference to the four European languages.

---

14. I would like to acknowledge my debt to Tim Shopen here for helping me so much to clarify the ideas contained in these two paragraphs, and also for his incisive editing of the whole chapter.

3.4 SEMANTIC NATURE OF EVENT ENCODED:

3.4.1 Pleasant Events Affecting the Body

In general, bodily events of a pleasant nature cannot be encoded in this construction which is adversative in nature as are all the passive constructions in Chinese. In contrast to this, many of the dative constructions in European languages are neutral with respect to any component of good luck or misfortune in their meaning: Compare the French example in (112) with the Chinese in (111):

111.        \*Ta bei Xiao Ying rou-le bei.  
          he BEI (name)     rub:COM back  
  
          (He had his back massaged by Xiao Ying.)

112.        Xiao Ying lui a massé le dos.  
          (name)     to:him has massaged the back

The use of a non-telic verb in (111) rou 'rub' which is an activity verb, engenders a situation where bei 'back' vies for interpretation as the real semantic undergoer with the subject ta 'he'. (This feature of non- $V_R$  verbs was discussed in Section 3.2 of this chapter.)

The 'adversity' component of this construction is totally predictable from the semantics of the regular passive with bei and is not a unique feature of this related construction. Thus, if we transform (111) into a regular passive with bei, the resultant form is equally unacceptable:

113.        \*Ta de bei bei Xiao Ying rou-le.  
          he GEN back BEI (name)     rub:COM  
  
          (His back was massaged by Xiao Ying.)

'Pleasant' actions applied to the body are also excluded because they do not cause a change of state in the affected body part; the latter being a major semantic constraint of the passive of bodily effect as outlined in Section 3.2.

Passive of Bodily Effect

114.        \*Ta bei Mali fumo - le yi-xia lian.  
             he BEI (name) caress:COM one:CL    face  
  
             (He had his face caressed by Mary.)

115.        Marie lui a caressé le visage.  
             (name) to:him has caressed the face

3.4.2        Good Health and Body Improvement

Are there any fortunate events where the action which affects the whole can cause a change of state in some part of the body of a beneficial nature? The answer is an unconditional no. If a person regains their health, even if it be through the aid of medical treatment, it will be expressed as a gradual change in Chinese by means of intransitive verb constructions or 'active form' S-V-O sentences.

Thus, such events are proscribed from the passive as they are seen as happening within the person themselves and not caused by some external agent. Secondly, such terms as 'health' and 'illness' cannot be encoded by the postverbal noun as they denote abstract concepts, not parts of the body in any sense of this term and the semantic formula thus excludes such concepts from occurring in this construction.

Consequently, it cannot be said in Chinese "She was skin shone on by the sun so that she became tanned" (116) or "He was acne shone on by the sun so that it all dried up" (117):



116. \*Ta bei taiyang shai-hei -le pifu.  
she BEI sun shine:black:COM skin

117. \*Ta bei taiyang shai-gan -le geda.  
he BEI sun shine:dry:COM acne

For beneficial events where the change is gradual and almost imperceptible, only intransitive predicates or S-V-(O) sentences may be used:

"Active-form": S-V

118. Ta lianshang de geda zhi-hao -le.  
his face:on GEN acne cure:well:COM  
The acne on his face has cleared up.

"Active Form": S-V

119. Ta huifu -le jiankang.  
he restore:COM health  
He was restored to health.

Passive

120. \*Ta bei zhei-zhong xin liaofa huifu -le jiankang.  
he BEI this:kind new treatment restore:COM health

(He had his health restored by this new kind of treatment.)

"Active Form": S-V

121. Ta de bing zhi-hao-le. / Ta hao le.  
he GEN illness cure:well:COM / he good INC  
His illness has been cured. / He's better now.

Passive

122. \*Ta bei daifu zhi-hao -le bing.  
he BEI doctor cure:well:COM illness

(He had his illness cured by the doctor.)

Other transitive verbs with animate agents which form predicates interpretable as beneficial events also prove to be unacceptable.

123.        \*Xiao Ying bei minjian yisheng jie-he -le tuigu.  
             (name)    BEI folk:doctor        set:together:COM femur

Example (123) is excluded because both the action and the resulting state referred to by the main verb does not extend over the person's body as a whole, but is restricted in scope to the particular body part. This constraint was also discussed in detail in Section 3.2. Neither does the English translation make sense:

\* Xiao Ying was set by the doctor so that a leg became together.

The same situation applies for beneficial states of affairs resulting from corrective surgery and the use of cosmetic aids, for example, perming of the hair or straightening of the nose:

124.        \*Ta bei lifayuan tang-juan - le toufa.  
             she BEI hairdresser perm:curl:COM hair

\*She was permed so that her hair became curly.

125.        \*Ta bei daifu nong-zheng - le bizi.  
             he BEI doctor do:straight:COM nose

\*He was done something to by the doctor so that his nose became straight.

### 3.4.3 Neutral Events

Not only are beneficial states of affairs excluded but also those of a neutral nature: In some European languages it is possible to use a dative construction for events such as "washing the hands":

126. French: Marie lui a lavé les mains.  
(name) to:him has washed the hands
127. German: Marie hat ihm die Hände gewaschen.  
(name) has to:him the hands washed
128. Italian: Marie gli ha lavato le mani.  
(name) to:him has washed the hands
129. Polish: Piotr umył Hance ręce.  
(name) wash to:Anna hands

As predicted, this is not possible in Chinese as it is not the whole person who is undergoing the washing but only the particular body part which is affected:

130. \*Ta bei Mali xi-ganjing le shou.  
he BEI (name) wash:clean COM hand  
  
\*He was washed (all over) by Mary so that his hands became clean.

Some of the European languages under discussion also permit 'invasion of a person's private space' in dative constructions, for example, German:<sup>15</sup>

131. Die Katze sprang mir auf den Tisch.  
the cat jumped to:me on the table
132. Er warf dem Studenten ein Steinchen aufs Buch.  
he threw to the student a pebble on:the book

French and Italian may also use the dative construction to express a similar kind of event:

---

15 See Neumann (1981, Section VII) and Wierzbicka (1979a:330-2) for more information on this category of dative sentence. Examples (131) and (132) taken from Neumann.

133. French: Il lui court derrière.  
he to:her runs behind

134. Italian: Pietro le è corso dietro.  
to:her has run behind

In Polish, however, only when a part of the body is explicitly stated in conjunction with this kind of event may the dative personal pronoun be used:

135. \*Biegł mi obok.  
he was running to me behind

136. Ciągle stoi mi za plecami.  
he is constantly standing to me behind (my) back

In Chinese, even though the relevant part of the body can be overtly expressed with this kind of event, the passive is still not acceptable:

137. \*Ta bei Zhang San pao zai ta de houmian.  
she BEI (name) run at she GEN behind  
(She had Zhang San running behind her.)

In this section, it has been shown that neither beneficial nor neutral events can be encoded in the passive of bodily effect, in contradistinction to the dative constructions in the four European languages. The passive of bodily effect encodes that an adverse state of affairs comes about for the undergoer, a feature it shares with other passive constructions in Chinese.

3.5 SEMANTIC RESTRICTIONS ON THE DETERMINACY OF THE BODY PART TERM

Having established in Section 3.3 that only parts of the body may be encoded as the predicate NP of this construction, in this section I propose to discuss the restrictions on the modification of this NP, comparing it with one of the French dative constructions.

When parts of the body are encoded as the inanimate subject of a regular bei passive construction, it is possible for such a subject to be highly specific and individuated. In contrast to this, in the passive of bodily effect, the body part terms located postverbally in the predicate may not be modified, that is, only non-modified, non-specified parts of the body are permissible in the postverbal position.

138. Ta de ying-gou bizi bei Li Si da-wai -le.  
he GEN eagle:hook nose BEI (name) hit:crooked:COM  
His Roman nose was knocked out of shape by Li Si.

139. \*Ta bei Li Si da-wai -le ying-gou bizi.  
he BEI (name) hit:crooked:COM eagle:hook nose  
(He had his Roman nose knocked out of shape by Li Si.)

Due to this restriction on postverbal NPs [exemplified by (139)], it is only possible to say:

140. Ta bei Li Si da-wai -le bizi.  
he BEI (name) hit:crooked:COM nose  
He was nose knocked out of shape by Li Si.

This rule is not unique to Chinese. In French, the dative construction with the definite article + body part term cannot be modified by adjectives either. The neutral construction with a possessive pronoun + body part term is the only one which can be used if there is an adjective involved.

Dative Construction:

141. Pierre lui a lavé la tête (\*sale)  
(name) to:him has washed the head (\*dirty)

Genitive Construction:

142. Pierre a lavé sa tête sale.  
(name) has washed his head dirty  
  
Pierre has washed his dirty hair.

Bally explains the semantic purpose of these two kinds of construction as this (1926:77):

A part of the body may be regarded as an integral part of the person or as detached from it ... as a simple thing. It's for an analogous reason that the idea of an integral part is obliterated when the object is characterized in whatsoever manner ... In all these cases, the object acquires a kind of personality itself, detached from the individual of which it is a part.

In other words, adjectival modification of the body part term causes it to be thought of as a separate, independent entity and thus to be no longer appropriate in an identifying expression.

If, however, the 'injury' is serious, the body part term may be modified by a numeral and a measure word for the Chinese construction. However, only the numeral 'one' may be employed as it is non-specific in meaning. - It does not indicate exactly which one of certain body parts occurring in pairs such as legs, ears, arms, eyes, hands and feet has been affected and the same applies

for the extremities - the fingers and toes. As a result, (143) is acceptable but not (144). In the following five examples, I use gebo 'arm' and tui 'leg' as being representative of all the body parts which occur in pairs:

143. Ta bei zidan da-duan -le yi-tiao gebo.  
he BEI bullet hit:break:COM one:CL arm  
He was one arm hit and broken by a bullet.

144. \*Ta bei diren da-duan -le liang-ge gebo.  
he BEI enemy hit:break:COM two:CL arm  
??He had two arms hit and broken by the enemy.

Sentence (144) would imply that the subject had more than two arms, only two of which were wounded due to its being so specific as to employ a numerical modifier.

If a verb such as da-shang 'to wound by hitting' is employed, where the injury is less serious in nature, then only a completely non-modified body part term may be combined with this predicate:

145. \*Ta bei diren da-shang -le yi-tiao tui.  
he BEI enemy hit:wound:COM one:CL leg  
?He had one of his legs wounded through the enemy's firing.

146. Ta bei diren da-shang -le tui.  
he BEI enemy hit:wound:COM leg  
He was leg wounded through the enemy's firing.

The underlying principle here seems to be that if the injury is of a minor nature in the first place [as "wounding" is in (145)], then it is difficult to interpret an overall lasting effect

on the person when the extent of the injury is even further minimized by using the numerical modifier "one" and thus confining the wounding to only one of a pair of body parts.

Note that the adjective shuang 'both' which does not take an intervening measure word can serve as a modifier of body parts which occur in pairs, but again, only for events of a serious nature. The use of "both" is not to enumerate but rather to encode that for certain kinds of body parts, the total was affected rather than just one of the two.

147.        Ta bei diren da-duan (\*da-shang) -le shuang tui.  
          he BEI enemy hit:break (\*hit:wound):COM both leg  
          He was both legs broken (\*wounded) in the enemy attack.

For small parts of the body such as fingers or fingernails, the use of numerals to specify exactly how many were affected by an event proves to be even more bizarre:

148.        \*Wang Xiao Er bei tamen ba-diao le liuge zhijia.  
          (name)        BEI they pull:out:COM six:CL fingernails  
          (Wang Xiao was six fingernails pulled out by them.)

149.        Wang Xiao Er bei tamen ba-diao -le shou zhijia.  
          (name)        BEI they pull:out:COM hand fingernail  
          Wang Xiao Er was fingernails pulled out by them.

In the case of a pianist or violinist where the number of fingers injured would be of extreme importance, the regular bei passive with the body part as subject NP would be used.

If numerals cannot be employed to specify the exact number of the kind of body part affected, then it is even less likely that demonstratives can be used, given their deictic function. This indeed proves to be the case:



150. Ta bei bunuren ge-diao le (\*nei-zhi) erduo.  
he BEI slavetraders cut:off:COM (\*that:CL) ear  
He was (\*that) ear cut off by the slavetraders.

The final piece of evidence that the postverbal body part term is linked inalienably to the person encoded as subject rather than being regarded as a separate entity, is the exclusion of possessive pronouns as modifiers of it:

151. Ta bei bunuren ge-diao-le (\*ta de) erduo.  
he BEI slaver cut:off:COM (\*he GEN) ear  
He was (\*his) ear(s) cut off by the slavetraders.

Yet, all these non-occurring examples may be changed into fully acceptable regular passives with the body part term as subject:

152. Ta de erduo bei bunuren ge-diao-le.  
he GEN ear BEI slaver cut:off:COM  
His ears were cut off by the slavetraders.

The conclusion to be gained from this data is that the body part term may be modified by 'one' or 'both' for events which cause bodily harm of a serious nature. Otherwise, this term must remain totally unspecified so that it can form part of a complex VP. Neither demonstratives, adjectives nor possessive pronouns are permitted to modify the body part term as such a modification would cause it to be understood as 'an entity in its own right' and so it could no longer be identified with the person designated by the subject but would need to be made into the subject NP of a regular passive.

In other words, the construction roughly has this meaning: "I think of what happened to a part Z of Y's body as of

something that happened to the person Y (not to something other than Y)".

If the injury is of a minor degree, exemplified by action verbs which combine with the stative verb "wounded" to form the resultative compound verbs which are obligatory in this construction, then this 'injury' cannot be further minimized by indicating that it was only one leg or arm that was wounded, nor through the specification of 'both' for body parts which occur in pairs. The philosophy behind this rule seems to be of the nature that there is not much difference in effect for the person concerned if one or both legs are wounded, but there is if it is a case of one or both legs being broken or disabled in some way. Hence, the degree of bodily harm is 'adequately' serious in the case of either one leg or both legs being broken and here the modification of the body part term does not cause the latter to be thought of as something separate from the person, whereas this is what happens when the resultant state of the subject is less easily interpretable as one of 'lasting effect' as in the case of 'wounded'.

Therefore, the second part of the conclusion is that the construction also encodes that "person Y is now unable to do something" as a result of the harm inflicted by the given event. The presence of this component in the semantic structure of this construction will be justified in the following section.

3.6 SEMANTIC NATURE OF THE BODY PART TERMS PERMISSIBLE:

3.6.1 Parts of the body versus places or areas on the body

Only parts of the body which are well-defined in form and easily individualizable can be encoded as the postverbal NP in this construction. These are: gebo 'arm', yanjing 'eye', erduo 'ear', ya 'tooth', bizi 'nose', toufa 'hair', naodai 'head', shou 'hand', zhitou 'finger', zhijia 'fingernail', tui 'leg', jiao 'foot' and jiaozhi 'toe'. Moreover, they all have a specific function with which they are associated. Many of these parts of the body have been exemplified above in the course of the discussion. We will see below that this semantic category is not confined purely to external parts of the body. - Some internal organs are intended to be included by this (informal) description, and by the subsequently formulated semantic explication.

As a consequence of the requirement of form, places on the body or areas of the body are not permissible. Thus, huai 'ankle', xigai 'knee', xigaigu 'kneecap', jianbang 'shoulder', lian 'face', etou 'forehead', xiongtang 'chest', duzi 'belly', datui 'thigh' and yao 'waist' are all excluded as they are designate either joints of the body or surface areas. To refine the description of body part terms permissible, only functional parts of the body that are put into direct use by us can be encoded as the postverbal NP in this passive construction in Chinese.

From an anatomical point of view, places on the body all have their own specific function too: They may enable other parts of the body to move, for example, the knee and the elbow enable the leg and the arm to bend, respectively. Nonetheless, their exclusion from this construction seems to imply that in Chinese they are not

viewed as directly enabling the person to do anything, unlike other parts of the body such as eyes, ears, legs and arms whose primary function is to directly enable the person to see, hear, walk and hold things, respectively.<sup>16</sup> Hence, the reason for the exclusion of places and areas on the body from the passive of bodily effect is the non-direct effect of their respective functions to the person as a whole. It is consequently difficult to interpret the disabling consequences of an event where these are involved.

153.        Ta de huai bei zidan da-sui -le.  
            he GEN ankle BEI bullet hit:smash:COM  
  
            His ankle was smashed when a bullet hit it.

154.        \*Ta bei zidan da-sui -le huai.  
            he BEI bullet hit:smash:COM ankle  
  
            (He had his ankle smashed when a bullet hit it.)

155.        Xiao Ying de yao bei ta da-shang-le.  
            (name)     GEN back BEI he hit:wound:COM  
  
            The small of Xiao Ying's back was hurt when he hit it.

156.        \*Xiao Ying bei ta da-shang-le yao.  
            (name)     BEI he hit:wound:COM back  
  
            (Xiao Ying had the small of her back hurt when he hit it.)

Examples (153) and (155) show the acceptability of the regular passive with places or areas of the body as the subject in contrast to the passives of bodily effect in (154) and (156) which are non-interpretable.

---

16 In Dyirbal, a language of north-eastern Queensland, it is the knee which is viewed as enabling the leg to move, as opposed to the situation in Chinese (Bob Dixon - personal communication). See also Dixon (1972).

This constraint accounts also for the exclusion of very small parts of the body such as muzhi 'thumb' and bilianggu 'bridge of the nose'. It is difficult to interpret, even slightly bizarre to imagine how such tiny sections of the body could have any kind of overall and sustained effect on the person as a whole.

157.        \*Ta bei chemen zhuang-po - le biliang-gu.  
          he BEI car door knock:break:COM bridge:of:nose  
  
          (He had the bridge of his nose broken when the car door hit it.)
158.        \*Zhang San bei tamen kan-diao-le you shou de muzhi.  
          (name) BEI they chop:off:COM right hand REL thumb  
  
          (Zhang San had the thumb of his right hand chopped off by them.)

In English too, it seems we can commonly talk about using the eyes to see or the legs to walk and so on while we can't talk about using areas or places on the body such as the face or kneecap or bridge of the nose to do anything. These intuitions are reflected in the unacceptability of the English sentences in (160):

159.    a. Use your eyes why don't you!  
          b. I saw him with my own two eyes.  
          c. You've got two legs, haven't you? Well use them!
160.    a. \*Use your kneecap to bend your leg.  
          b. \*I kneed him with my kneecap.  
          c. \*I used my face to see, by pointing it in the right direction.

Thus, it is only functional parts of the body which are put into direct use by us that may be encoded by the Chinese construction.

3.6.2 Internal Body Parts

Is this construction restricted to external body parts? To a very limited extent, internal body parts may be used in the passive of bodily effect, being subject to two kinds of constraints: The first one is the concrete vs non-tangible dichotomy, previously touched upon in the course of discussion. The observability factor comes into play to the effect that wherever an external part of the body is substitutable, it will be preferred.

- 161        Ta bei zhuankuai zhen-shang        le (\*xiao nao/ naozi)  
            she BEI brick        vibrate:wound COM (\*cerebellum/brain)  
  
            naodai.  
            head  
  
            She was head (\*cerebellum/brain) wounded through  
            concussion from a brick.

162.        Ta bei qiche ya-sui        -le (\*tuigu) tui.  
            she BEI car    crush:smash:COM (\*femur) leg  
  
            She was legs (\*femur) crushed by a car.

This has analogues in English where it is more likely for (163) to be said than (164) in colloquial speech:

163.        She broke her back/neck/arm.

164.        She broke her spine/\*neckbone/?ulna.

Secondly, functional systems within the body such as hearing, sight and the vocal organs are likewise excluded, due to their non-tangible or non-observable nature.

165.        \*Ta bei jiqi de zaoyin    sunhai-le    tingli.  
            he BEI machine REL noise impair:COM hearing  
  
            (He had his hearing impaired by industrial noise.)

Generally, an active construction will be preferred in this semantic area, such as (166) over (165):

166.        Jiqi de zaoyin sunhai le ta de tingli.  
             machine REL noise impair:COM he GEN hearing  
             Industrial noise impaired his hearing.

In sum, the sense faculties as opposed to the sense organs are proscribed, and even the small parts that go to make up such systems. Once again, the effect produced over the entire person is difficult to interpret. This category includes such small parts as eardrum and appendix.

167.        \*Ta bei Li Si ci-chuan -le ermo.  
             he BEI (name) pierce:through:COM eardrum  
             (He had his eardrum pierced right through by Li Si.)

168.        \*Li Si bei yisheng qie-chu-le lanwei.<sup>17</sup>  
             (name) BEI doctor cut:out:COM appendix  
             (Li Si had his appendix cut out by the doctor.)

Due to this constraint, very few examples with internal body parts are to be found, excepting those with leigu 'rib' and gutou 'bones'. Perhaps these are able to be interpreted as "tangible" if not "observable" in the sense that the shape of the body is determined by the skeletal framework and so the form of the ribs and other bones of the body are, in this sense, observable from the outside as opposed to the case for the appendix and eardrum. Consequently, body part terms denoting internal organs are mainly

---

17 Note that the English have construction used here to give the meaning that was sought for the Chinese examples is not subject to the same restrictions on its body part term.

excluded from the passive of bodily effect. This list includes ganzang 'liver', pi 'spleen', yaozi 'kidney', houlong 'throat', sangzi 'voice' or 'throat', xinzang 'heart', duzi 'guts' or 'belly' and naozi 'brain'.

Gutou 'bones' when used in the sense of most of the skeletal framework (not just a few insignificant bones!) may be felicitously employed in this construction:

169.       Ta bei qiche ya-sui -le gutou.  
          she BEI car crush:smash:COM bones  
          She was bones crushed by a car.

However, 'heart' is not acceptable which brings us to the second constraint: This construction does not permit an interpretation of the subject being affected by an event which involves a part of the body to the extent that death results. In other words, death is excluded as one kind of "lasting effect" encoded by this construction.

This explains why da-si 'die from being beaten' (or any other resultative compound verb formed with si 'die') cannot co-occur with a body part term in this construction. Only personal NPs can have death predicated of them and not parts of the body, and as pointed out earlier, the stative verb of the resultative verb compound always refers exclusively to the resultant state of the body part.

Therefore, this construction can neither encode minor injury nor can it encode serious injury that results in death. This feature of meaning also accounts for the rarity of examples with internal body parts. Large internal organs such as the stomach as opposed to the heart are just barely acceptable when they co-occur



with predicates such as "pierce through" or "perforate" in (70) but not with "wound by hitting". (The latter is obviously restricted to external body parts.) Moreover, it is unacceptable for semantic reasons as well to say "Li Si was heart pierced by a bullet" rather than simply "Li Si died" or "Li Si was killed" shown by (170). This situation is ameliorated somewhat by changing the body part term in (170) to "stomach", since such an event is less certain to result in death:

170.        ?Li Si bei zidan chuan-tou     -le wei (\*xinzang).  
            (name) BEI bullet pierce:through:COM stomach (\*heart)  
  
            ?Li Si was stomach (\*heart) perforated by a bullet.

This section has set out to examine precisely what kind of body parts are permissible in the passive of bodily effect. Areas and places on the body were shown to be excluded as were non-tangible parts of the body mainly comprising the internal organs. Only those parts, therefore, which are tangible and functional may fill the role of the postverbal noun.

### Conclusion

In the preceding semantic analysis of the passive of bodily effect, I have claimed that it exclusively encodes an inalienable relation between a person and a part of the body. The inalienable nature of this relation is seen first of all in the interpretation of both the person and the body part as undergoing the action. Although the state resulting from this action refers exclusively to the body part, the person is understood to be adversely affected by this new state of affairs as well. In this

manner, the identification of the part of the body with the person is complete - and inalienable.

The semantic principle underlying this construction may be paraphrased in the following way: The change of state in the part of the body which is caused by the passive event can only be one which affects the normal functioning of the whole and the person becomes unable to do something as a result. However, this effect cannot go so far as to cause the destruction of the whole and end in the death of the person nor can it be so minor as to have no disabling effect on the person. Both these interpretations are proscribed from being made.

These semantic features were unfolded during the course of the presentation with each being argued for successively and are explicated in terms of the following semantic formula:

SEMANTIC FORMULA

PASSIVE OF BODILY EFFECT

Syntactic Schema:

NP <sub>P</sub>	BEI	NP <sub>P</sub>	V <sub>R</sub>	<u>LE</u>	N <sub>BP</sub>
Undergoer		Agent			Part of the body

Example:

Ta bei feitu nong-xia -le yanjing.  
 he BEI bandit do:blind:COM eye

Person A	Person B	Body Part Z
----------	----------	-------------

"He was done something to by bandits so that his eyes became blind."

Thinking of this person (A)  
I say:

Something happened to person A (event Y)  
because person B did something to A  
a body part Z came to be in a certain state  
because of this  
(Z can be thought of as part of person A's body)  
I don't need to say any more about body part Z  
Person A became unable to do something because of this  
I'm thinking of Y as something  
serious and something that was bad for A.

I want to say something about person A  
not because I want to say something  
about anything else  
I say something about person B and body part Z  
because I want to say something about A.

In what we could call the 'traditional' analysis of the get passive only the syntactic structure has been considered with the result that the observation of its formal similarity to the be passive has concealed an underlying semantic structure which is unique. The task of the analysis presented here is to explicate the semantic structure of the get passive and show how it differs from the be passive.

The chapter begins with an outline of the attitudes of earlier grammarians towards the use of get, followed by a brief description of two kinds of different passive constructions in Vietnamese and Greek.

An appraisal of two comparatively recent articles that specifically deal with the get passive precedes the main section where the semantic analysis of the get passive is presented. Here the argument in favour of postulating six get passive subconstructions is given. Informal descriptions of the get passive in terms of it being a construction which expresses both adversity and benefit and where responsibility for the event is attributed to the subject are reduced into the less complex but more precise and easily understood terms of the semantic formulae.

This analysis of the get passive is presented prior to the analyses of the rang and jiao passives in Chinese in order to enable certain parallels to be drawn between the adversative get passive and the rang passive.

Components of meaning present in both the get passive on the one hand and the rang and jiao passives on the other have been

independently hinted at in previous analyses in the feature of all three being considered more colloquial and somehow more 'expressive' if not 'emotive' than either the be passive or the bei passive (respectively).

That the rang and jiao passives in Chinese have generally been claimed to be the mere colloquial variants of the bei passive is also tied closely to the formal similarity of these three passive constructions. This formal similarity is however only superficial, revealed by the syntactic and semantic differentiation of both colloquial passives from the bei passive in Chapters 5 and 6 of Part II.

Moreover, in Chapter 5 of Part II below which specifically deals with the rang passive, I claim that this construction shares the following components of meaning with one of the get passive constructions - The Non-Reflexive Adversative Get Passive: the causal involvement of the subject, the adversative yet avoidable nature of the passive event and the inference of blame which can be made by the speaker.

The fact that a passive construction exists in English similar to the rang passive in Chinese enhances the case argued below for the latter.

---

Chapter 4, "The get passive in English", has been published under the title of "Is the get passive adversative?" in Papers in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communication 13 (3) 1980:411-452.

The original publication has been slightly modified for the purpose of incorporating it into my doctoral thesis and an introduction has been added. One paragraph was also rewritten, this being indicated in the appropriate footnote.

#### 4.1 EARLIER ATTITUDES TO THE USE OF GET

In English, the use of the get passive has remained relatively unanalysed. In the past, grammarians have tended to view the choice of get as the passive auxiliary, rather than be, as only causing a negligible difference in meaning. On the other hand, the multifarious uses of get have long been a contentious point of discussion in traditional grammar books and handbooks of style.

In the earlier approaches, predominantly during the 19th and early 20th centuries, get was generally condemned as vulgar and colloquial.<sup>1</sup> Later grammarians such as Jespersen and Curme, in opposition to these prescriptive (and proscriptive) tendencies, characterized the difference between the passive constructions having either get or be as their auxiliaries, as one of a dynamic-stative contrast, although they continued to regard get as an 'expressive colloquialism' whenever it wasn't necessary to disambiguate an adjective from the past participle of the passive. (Jespersen 1949:109; Curme 1931:445-46) Jespersen provides the following example where get is able to distinguish 'state' from 'transition' (1949:108):

"At that time he was not married. He got married in 1920."  
(where, presumably, 'married' is an adjective in the first instance, but a past participle in the second) - yet, such a description gives us only a glimpse of the underlying semantics of the get passive.

---

1 See Wallace Rice, (1932), "Get and got" for a survey of representative attitudes to the many uses of get from the late 18th century to the 20th century.

\* I would particularly like to thank Avery Andrews and Tim Shopen for their valuable comments and criticism of an earlier draft of this chapter.

Despite this lone observation concerning the active-stative contrast between get and be, most descriptions of the passive remain based on an underlying assumption that the two constructions are formally identical from the point of view of syntax, and thus, the choice of auxiliary is considered arbitrary. It is this view which hindered the search for the semantic properties that differentiate the get passive from the be passive.

On the other hand, when data is examined from other languages, we find the use of alternative passive markers or passive constructions does, in fact, signal semantic differences.

#### 4.2 TWO UNUSUAL KINDS OF PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION

In recent studies of Asian languages, several analyses have singled out a certain kind of passive construction which grammatically codifies the notion of adversity or misfortune, in contradistinction to neutral or other types of passives.<sup>2</sup> A well-known example is the Vietnamese adversative passive, which uses a special morphological exponent, bi, to encode this feature. Compare

---

2 Apart from the preceding chapters on the adversative bei passive in Chinese, see particularly:

- (a) Marybeth Clark, (1974b), "Submissive verbs as adversatives in some Asian languages" for Japanese, Thai, Lao and Cambodian.
- (b) Wang Li, (1944), Zhongguo Yufa Lilun (The Theory of Chinese Grammar) In Vol.I, pp.175-85, Wang Li points out that active form sentences cannot be paraphrased by passives (and retain the same meaning) because of the intrinsically adversative nature of bei, the passive marker.
- (c) Anna Wierzbicka, (1979b), "Are grammatical categories vague or polysemous? The Japanese 'adversative' passive in a typological context."

the following related active and passive sentences (cited in Clark, 1974b: 94-95; her numbering and translation):

10.        họ giết ông ấy  
          they kill    man    that  
  
          They killed him.

11.        Ông ấy bị (họ) giết  
          man    that Pass.    (they) kill  
  
          (He underwent adversely: They kill him.)  
  
          He was killed.

Even when the active form describes a desirable state of affairs, the corresponding passive with bị can only depict the contrary situation: (examples taken from Keenan, 1978: 20; his numbers)

21.    a.    Bao thương Quang  
          Bao love    Quang  
  
          Bao loves Quang.

      b.    Quang bị Bao thương  
          Quang Pass. Bao    love  
  
          Quang is loved by Bao. (ironic: she is loved by Bao despite her wishes)

From this kind of data, it is possible to conclude that the adversative connotation of the bị passive in Vietnamese is not determined by the meaning of the verb, but rather by the meaning of the syntactic construction taken as a whole.

Moreover, in contrast to the other Asian languages whose adversative passive constructions have been described (such as those in Japanese, Thai, Lao, Cambodian and Mandarin Chinese), Vietnamese



also has a passive of good fortune, formed with the submissive verb duoc (Keenan, 1978: 20):

- b. Quang duoc Bao thuong  
Quang Pass. Bao love  
Quang is loved by Bao. (beneficial for Quang)

In Chinese, no choice between adversative and beneficial passives exists as all the passive constructions are uncompromisingly adversative in nature:<sup>3</sup>

1. \* Mali bei (rang) (jiao) ta gei - le yiben shu.  
(name) (Passive markers) he give:COM one:CL book
2. Mali bei (rang) (jiao) ta piping - le yixia.  
(name) (Passive markers) he criticize:COM one:CL  
Mary was criticized by him.

In contrast to the adversative passive construction of Asian languages, (possibly an areal feature of this region), another kind of passive has been described in Modern Greek, which conveys the subject's causal involvement in the event; while excluding reference to specific agents (examples from Warburton, 1975: 563, my numbering and her translations):

Active form:

3. a. o janis skotose to niko  
Nom. John kill Acc. Nick  
John killed Nick.

---

3 In the original publication, I claimed that the rang passive was a neutral construction encoding neither adversity nor good luck. After further research, this proved to be false, requiring a rewriting of this paragraph. See Chapter 5 of Part II for the results of my investigation into the semantic and syntactic properties of the rang passive.

Passive with non-specific agent:

- b. o    nikos   skotothike   apo   tus   exthrus  
Nom. Nick   kill:Pass.   by   the   enemy

Nick got (himself) killed and the source or cause of his death was the enemy.

Passive with specific agent:

- c. ?o    nikos   skotothike   apo   to   jani  
Nom. Nick   kill:Pass.   by   John

In Modern Greek, the only way that 'Nick' can be encoded as the theme (or topic) but, at the same time, the semantic 'patient' of the event, including reference to a specific agent, is by means of a patient-focus construction which has the normal active verb morphology. However, it requires a different word order from the active sentence construction as well as the obligatory presence of the verbal enclitic, indicating that 'Nick' is grammatically the direct object. Moreover, there is no implication of causal involvement on the part of 'Nick'.

Patient-focus construction:

- d. to    niko    ton    skotose    o    janis  
Acc. Nick   Acc.   kill   Nom.   John  
                  enclitic

Nick was killed by John.

These examples from two languages, one related to and the other genetically distinct from English, reveal several important dimensions along which passives vary, not only within the one language but also cross-linguistically. In the next section, I will show that such semantic parameters are also crucial in distinguishing the get passive from the be passive in English.

4.3 OTHER ANALYSES OF THE GET PASSIVE

Despite the traditional view that censured the use of get as 'inelegant' and 'colloquial', it persisted in its function as an alternative auxiliary to be, and became increasingly popular in use (see, for example, Visser, 1969:2031). Nevertheless, this was the dominant trend in analysis until the appearance of Anna Granville Hatcher's article in 1949, entitled "To Be/Get Invited", a detailed though-be-it non-formal examination of the semantics of the get passive construction. She effectively argues against the traditional description of the get passive as merely the colloquial alternative to the be passive with hard evidence of many cases where get cannot be substituted for be, concluding with the remarks "the use of get as a passive auxiliary is greatly limited" (1949:435). Even more significant is her view that "get will be used for only two types of events - those felt as having either fortunate or unfortunate consequences for the subject" (1949:441). Hatcher's article clearly points to the possibility of the be and get passives possessing different semantic structures.

Robin Lakoff has similarly noted this polarization of the get passive in her 1971 article "Passive Resistance": "The get passive in English, unlike the be passive, is frequently used to reflect the attitude of the speaker toward the events described in the sentence: whether he feels they are good or bad, or reflect well or poorly on him..." (1971:154).

In addition to this, both writers have independently reached the conclusion that the get passive conveys the notion of 'responsibility' on the part of the subject (similar to the passive

in Greek), which Lakoff also characterizes elsewhere as the "active involvement" of the subject in the event (Lakoff, p.151; Hatcher, p.437). In the get passive, then, the subject is thought of as having more control in determining the resulting situation than for the corresponding be passive where the subject is purely an undergoer.

Although Hatcher provides very clear-cut examples to prove her point about the restrictions on the use of get, her evidence is not conclusive for either the 'responsibility' factor or for the dichotomization of events into fortunate and unfortunate. In the end, she gives a diachronic explanation of the development of get as a passive auxiliary rather than formalizing the semantic properties of get which she has skilfully singled out in the main body of her article. The situation is similar for Lakoff's article: She concludes that the get passive has a different semantic structure from the be passive without, however, proposing one.

Subsequent to these two thought-provoking articles by Hatcher and Lakoff, Marybeth Clark has tentatively suggested that get functions like the submissive verbs in the adversative passives of Asian languages (This proposal was independent of reference to the two earlier analyses) (1974b:104-5). This only serves to enlarge the area of tantalizingly unresolved questions concerning the nature of the get passive. Is the get passive adversative, then? The following semantic analysis will show that such a characterization only constitutes part of the answer.

#### 4.4 THE GET PASSIVE IN GENERAL

In fact, the get passive can be divided into several related constructions, which although formally identical from the

point of view of syntax, differ conceptually. Furthermore, only some of these get passives are 'adversative', others codify the beneficial nature of the passive event for the subject (foreshadowed by the evidence and remarks of earlier investigators).

In this chapter, I will proceed one step further in the differentiation of the get passive from the be passive by undertaking a semantic analysis of the get passive which will result in the formalization of its semantic properties.

Ideally a thorough analysis of the semantics of the get passive would include an analysis of all the get constructions in English, related through their sharing of certain semantic components. For example, what is the relationship of the get passive:

Jane got invited.

to the causative use of get:

Jane got her friend to invite Mary.

as well as to the passivized causative:

Jane got Mary invited.

and even its relationship to the simple get construction?:

Jane got an invitation.

The discussion of such questions cannot be confined within the limits of this analysis, so I will concentrate here solely on the get passive.

The constructions I wish to analyse have either this form:

Np    got    V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.<sup>4</sup>

Jane   got    fired/promoted.

---

4    The past participle of any transitive verb is the intended meaning here of the schematization V<sub>Tr</sub> ...ed. I use -ed rather than -en to indicate the past tense suffix since weak verbs with this ending are in the majority.

or this form:

N<sub>P</sub> got + reflexive pronoun V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.  
Jane got herself fired/promoted.

with incidental remarks on the related constructions where an inanimate noun is the subject of the get passive:

N<sub>P</sub>'s N<sub>IN</sub> got V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.  
Jane's bike got stolen/fixe

where N<sub>P</sub> = personal noun  
N<sub>IN</sub> = inanimate noun  
V<sub>Tr</sub> = transitive verb

At this point, I will make some general observations about the get passive, while pointing out which get constructions are being excluded from the analysis.

The get passive has a two-argument semantic structure: An external agent is either implied or explicitly expressed in the surface structure by means of an agentive by phrase:

Jane got fired by the director.

Initially, I will propose this semantic representation for the passive:

Something happened to Jane (X)  
because someone else (the director) (Y) did something

where the semantic component "Something happened to Jane" is used to show the change of state that occurs, which can be stated informally as "Something different can be said about Jane", i.e. "Jane no longer had that job after that".

That a second person's actions are crucial to the meaning of the get passive is verified by an additional piece of evidence: Stative verbs such as those of emotion and thought are not compatible with it, unless they are conceived of as verbs of action in the particular context:

4. a. Jane  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{was} \\ \text{\textcircled{e}got} \end{array} \right\}$  loved/liked/disliked.<sup>5</sup>
- b. John  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{was} \\ \text{\textcircled{e}got} \end{array} \right\}$  considered a fool/genius.
- c. The C.I.A.  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{was} \\ \text{\textcircled{e}got} \end{array} \right\}$  believed to be the source of information

(A comment on the use of the symbol "⊘" in this chapter: "⊘" designates sentences for which it is extremely difficult to imagine any likely context where they could be used. Hence, they are not being excluded as ungrammatical since they are at least 'well-formed' in regard to their syntactic configuration.)

Similarly, with inanimate subjects, get is not possible with verbs which denote spontaneous change, and thereby exclude an external agent, by definition:

5. a. The window pane was cracked (\*by the children).
- b. \*The window pane got cracked by the children.

A second observation which distinguishes the get passive from the be passive is that the subject has to be thought of as 'pre-existing' before it can be considered as causally involved in the event. Here, I use 'pre-existing' informally to mean that the

---

5 Some of the verbs in 4(a) may form acceptable reflexive get passives however. For example, "Jane got herself disliked by everybody for doing that" although "??Jane got herself loved" is not semantically well-formed for me.

person or thing denoted by the subject must be an entity that is identifiable for at least the speaker, that is, a specific image in the speaker's mind, before an event involving the subject can be predicated of it.<sup>6</sup> Thus, verbs of 'creation' are not likely to be compatible with the get passive, no matter how definite in reference the subject is made in the surface structure:

6. a. A baby { was } born on Christmas eve.  
          { ~~got~~ }
- b. My little sister { was } born in January.  
                          { ~~got~~ }
- c. A house { was } built on the vacant lot.  
                  { ~~got~~ }

Further proof of this constraint is shown in the following examples, where a get passive can only be interpreted when the speaker is thinking of a specific person, and not the body of that person:

7. a. Grandma { was } cremated yesterday  
              { ~~got~~ }
- b. Lord Mountbatten { was } buried in state.  
                          { ~~got~~ }
- c. The corpses { were } buried quickly to prevent the  
                      { ~~got~~ } spread of disease.

It is easy to confuse the get passive construction with an inchoative use of get, which often takes an adjectival predicative:

---

6. The same case holds for the bei passive in Chinese. This semantic property of the Chinese construction was discussed above in Section 1.2.



N<sub>p</sub> got + adjective  
Jane got angry/upset.

I have already pointed out that two components of the get passive are: .

Something happened to this person (X)  
because someone else (Y) did something

where the action of a second person(s) is integral to the meaning, although the action is always left unspecified, if not the agent in the actual surface structure. The inchoative get construction however has a one-argument semantic structure: An entity (the subject) begins to be in a new state as the result of some event, usually unspecified. The confusion arises when an adjective is identical in form to the past participle. Despite this formal identity, the two constructions are able to be distinguished syntactically as the inchoative get construction takes adverbial modification, particularly adverbs of degree and intensity such as very, in contrast to the impossibility of this with the get passive:

8. a. John got very upset.
- b. \*John got very killed.

The semantic representation of the inchoative get construction could be roughly formulated like this:

9. a. Jane got beautifully tanned in the November sun.
- b. Jane got injured by a falling rock. (≠by John)

Jane came to be in a certain state  
because of something that happened at that time.

There is also another small subset of get constructions, which have the usual passive interpretation when a second person is implicit, but a kind of 'reflexive' interpretation when the subject is the only person involved:

10. a. John got married  
b. ~~John~~ got married by Mary.
11. a. John got engaged.  
b. ~~John~~ got engaged by Mary.
12. a. John got dressed. (he did it himself)

For the construction where only one person is involved, and the inception of a new state of affairs is depicted, the following semantic representation is proposed:

John came to be in a certain state that he wanted  
because he did something

There is also a passive interpretation available for the latter class of get sentences:

13. a. John got married by the Pope. (the Pope performed the ceremony)  
b. John got engaged as an apprentice.  
c. John got dressed by his valet.

The semantic structure of these get passives will be accounted for in the analysis of one of the major get passive constructions in the following presentation. (q.v. 4.5.2 (i) The Non-Reflexive Beneficial Get Passive.)

In each section, I will make some general observations about the get passive, contrasting it with the be passive to highlight the semantic properties of the former; then, I will adduce evidence for the semantic representation of each construction.

#### 4.5 THE GET PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

##### 4.5.1 'Adversative' Get Passives with a Person as the Undergoer

###### (i) THE NON-REFLEXIVE 'ADVERSATIVE' GET PASSIVE

$N_P$  got  $V_{Tr}$ ...ed.

Jane got fired.

The notion of the subject's causal involvement in the passive event is realized differently in the semantic structure of each get passive - subtle distinctions blurred by the use of vague terms such as 'control', 'initiative on the part of the subject' or 'responsibility'. In fact, the latter turn out to cover several components of meaning, although only in the form of an inexact correspondence.

The implication of the non-reflexive adversative passive is that the subject could have prevented the unfortunate state of affairs from coming about. If the speaker considers the subject an innocent victim of circumstances, then the get passive is not appropriate, and the be passive must be used instead:

14. a. Half the population of Kampuchea  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{was} \\ \cancel{\text{got}} \end{array} \right\}$

systematically annihilated under the Pol Pot regime.

b. Vietnamese women and children  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{were} \\ \cancel{\text{got}} \end{array} \right\}$  massacred

in the My Lai offensive.

Similarly, the get passive is not suitable if the subject is thought of as completely under the control of another person, and consequently has no choice but to do whatever is desired by the agent. The ability to prevent misfortune is not brought into question, and because of this, the subject is considered to be totally passive:

15. a. "Women, especially black activists, have uncovered countless stories of Aboriginal women who  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{were} \\ \cancel{\text{got}} \end{array} \right\}$  sterilized without their consent or knowledge." (from a New South Wales WAAC newsletter, early 1978)
- b. The platoon  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{was} \\ \cancel{\text{got}} \end{array} \right\}$  ordered to march.
- c. Seven slaves  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{were} \\ \cancel{\text{got}} \end{array} \right\}$  bought.
- d. Germany  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{was} \\ \cancel{\text{got}} \end{array} \right\}$  forced to surrender.

A clear-cut example of this be/get distinction is taken from the story of the crucifixion. In a discussion of the theological subtleties, either be or get could be used, but with different implications:

16. Christ  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{was} \\ \text{got} \end{array} \right\}$  crucified.

If the predestined nature of the crucifixion is uppermost in the mind of the speaker, then be is most appropriately used, since in this case, Christ would be considered to have no choice in determining the outcome. On the other hand, perhaps an enemy (for example, Judas) would use get to imply that Christ could have

prevented it from happening, thinking of his refusal of each of Pontius Pilates's offers.

This clear semantic distinction between be and get can be precisely captured by two additional components in the semantic representation of the get passive:

This person could've done something else  
because of which it wouldn't have happened

which forms part of the full explication of the causal chain in this way:

Something bad happened to this person (X)  
because someone else (Y) did something  
X could've done something else  
because of which this wouldn't have happened

These features are very clear in the following example:  
McMurphy, the anti-hero of the novel One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest relates his personal history as a gambler-brawler to the other inmates of the asylum, explaining how he ended up in gaol:

To tell the truth, this 'sault and battery I was doing in Pendleton was the first hitch in close to a year. That's why I got busted. I was outa practice; this guy was able to get up off the floor and get to the cops before I left town. (Ken Kesey, 1962:22-23, my underlining.)

The semantic components in the formal explication are manifested in this way: If McMurphy had been more wary, and perhaps in better fighting condition, he wouldn't have been caught. Similarly, the warning addressed to a gang of professional robbers in a scene from a 'Wild West' show, by a young man who is being pressured to join their ranks:

"Stealing - I can't see anything wrong with it  
- as long as you don't get hung."

contains the implication that one of the risks involved in earning a living in such a way, could be avoided, for instance, if they changed their lifestyle. Therefore, in both cases, the subject is thought of as being able to prevent the particular undesirable state of affairs.

There is another reason why the get passive is not likely to be chosen to express a passive event such as:

16. Christ { was } crucified.  
          { got }

which involves a further restriction on the usage of get as opposed to be. The improbability of get (we wouldn't expect to hear it from the followers of Christianity, for example, although it would be appropriate in the words of an enemy such as Judas: "Jesus refused to establish a kingdom on earth, so he got crucified instead, the fool!") is accounted for by the frequent negative inference made by the speaker with regard to the subject. This arises, I believe, from the last two components of the semantic representation, explicating the subject's failure to prevent an 'avoidable' misfortune. It is manifested in diverse ways, for example: disapproval or contempt for the subject's ineptitude or foolishness.

The subject's inverted causal role (in allowing an undesirable situation to come about that could have been avoided) is thus intimately connected with the inference of 'blame', 'contempt' or 'disapproval', if it is made by the speaker. On the contrary, in the be passive, where the subject is not depicted as having any causal role (the subject plays no part in determining the resulting situation), allusion to fault or negligence cannot be made. It is

not an inference that arises from the meaning grammaticalized by the be passive.

However, I cannot claim this to be a semantic invariant of the get passive, since we can also find examples where the speaker is in sympathy with the subject's predicament, even though a get passive has been used to show that the subject could have avoided the particular misfortune:

17. a. My friend, Joe, got arrested every time he went to Panama.  
b. My younger brother went to Israel and got drafted.

Lakoff, who also points out the objective-affective contrast between the be and get passives in her article, phrases it in terms of the "speaker's involvement in the event", an observation left unclarified. She writes (1971:155):

If we think of ... an item on a news program ... (where a reporter will at least try to present the appearance of objectivity toward the news he reports) get will be very odd, and be normal, indicating that the speaker has no feelings about what took place...

- 14(a) My cache of marijuana got found by Fido the police dog.  
14(b) A cache of marijuana was found by Fido the police dog.

In (14a) the sense of the speaker's involvement in the action and his unhappiness with it, are very clear.

She concludes that "the get passive, often suggests the active involvement, emotional or otherwise, of the superficial subject..." (1971:160).

Although I agree with the spirit of all these observations, Lakoff's use of 'involved' is extremely misleading. In some places, she uses it to mean 'emotionally involved' and in others 'actively involved' and this is further confused when the

roles of subject and speaker are not properly distinguished either: In (14a), the subject and speaker are identical, whereas this is not the case in (14b). In her article, examples such as (14a) are generalized as the typical case. Ultimately, the lack of clarification concerning whether or not it is the speaker or the superficial subject who is 'involved' in the event, and whether or not this involvement is 'active' or 'emotional' and with regard to who, detracts from her argument. A counterexample is easy to find for one of the combinations of these four variables:

Che Guevara got assassinated.

Here the speaker and the subject are not the same person, and it is impossible to think of the subject as being 'emotionally involved' in the sense of feeling something as a result of this event. That is, we could not borrow Lakoff's terminology and say that "Guevara's unhappiness with the event is clear". Therefore, 'emotional involvement' as far as the subject is concerned is not part of the semantic structure of the get passive.

To the contrary, I claim that the 'affective nature' of the get passive is explained by the presence of the components:

This person could've done something else  
because of which this wouldn't have happened

- the components explicating the causal role of the subject that allow the speaker to make an inference of a negative nature about the subject, if desired.

(ii) THE REFLEXIVE 'ADVERSATIVE' GET-PASSIVE:

N<sub>p</sub> got + reflexive pronoun V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.  
Jane got herself fired.



In the reflexive form of the adversative passive, the source of the misfortune is explicitly attributed to some action performed by the subject. These features are explicated by the components:

Something bad happened to Jane (X)  
because someone else did something  
because Jane had done something

which distinguishes it clearly from the non-reflexive adversative in which the third component is missing. The reflexive adversative is more appropriately used, the clearer the subject's causal action or activity is made by the context:

18. John gets violent when he's drunk. That's why he got himself bashed up in the pub last night.
19. That backyard abortionist got himself arrested.

In each case, the activity or actions preceding the unfortunate event are clear whether due to aggressive behaviour or due to an illegal medical operation. Thus, this construction is very compatible for occasions when the speaker wants to depict the subject as 'tempting fate' through provocative actions or perhaps what the speaker judges to be some kind of ill-considered behaviour, expected to lead to an unfortunate state of affairs. Hence, the reflexive adversative also encodes a component to the effect that if the subject had refrained from this particular action or activity, the misfortune would have been prevented. This is explicated by the last two components in the fuller representation:

Jane got herself fired.

Something bad happened to Jane (her firing)  
because someone else did something (her employer)  
because Jane had done something (she was always  
late to work)

Jane could've not done this (been late)  
because of which it wouldn't have happened (she  
wouldn't have been fired)

(In the get-passive, unless the speaker resorts to the use of subordinate clauses, he or she cannot specify exactly how the event came about, and not always who else was involved, so these variables are, suitably, left unexpressed in the representation. Examples of these variables are supplied in parentheses for what otherwise, context would supply.)

The attribution of 'fault' or 'blame' is an inference available with the reflexive adversative as well, due to the explicit causal involvement of the subject, and particularly due to the last two components:

Jane could've not done this  
because of which it wouldn't have happened

In fact, it is a much more conspicuous overtone in the reflexive form than in the non-reflexive passive.

20. Joe got himself kicked in the shins for that remark. (The fool!)

The combination of all these semantic components gives the overall effect of this get passive where the misfortune is imagined to be the result of intentional causation on the part of the subject:

In the example: Jane got herself fired, the passive event is thought of as if Jane wanted it to happen, by the speaker. For example, she kept coming to work late and this is viewed by the

speaker as if she wanted to cause her employer to fire her. This does not mean that Jane really wanted to cause her own firing, but rather is the way in which the speaker imagines the situation.

In Bernardo Bertolucci's film "1900", there is a scene evocative of the social changes occurring in the aftermath of World War I. The padrone of a small village in southern Italy berates the peasants who work for him in a feudal-style relationship:

"What happened to all the men? - They went off to war and got themselves killed."

The get passive is used here to insinuate that the men deliberately set off to meet their death in war and so, deprive the padrone of labour. In fact, he is trying to justify his recent purchase of farm machinery to gradually replace the peasant workforce by apportioning 'blame' to the peasant men.

The component of supposed intentional causation ("It can be thought of as if this person wanted it to happen") is manifested clearly in this example: The sequence of events is viewed as if the men wanted to die in the first place, which caused them to decide on an 'appropriate' course of action (enlisting, going to war) to achieve this end.

It should be stressed that in the reflexive adversative, the speaker is not saying that the subject actually wants to cause the misfortune by acting in a way conducive to it, but rather implies that this kind of behaviour ultimately causes the same situation to arise as encoded by syntactic constructions that do express intentional causation (for example, the beneficial get passive).

In the initial example, Jane got herself fired, if the subject is viewed as wanting this state of affairs to come about,

(Jane preferred to live on the dole, so she tried her hardest to displease her employers to make them fire her), then the interpretation is that of a beneficial get passive (4.5.2 (ii)). Equally, in the case of a suicidal 'Jane' in Jane got herself killed, (where she didn't want to kill herself, but induced someone else to do it), although this may be generally regarded as unfortunate, from the point of view of the subject, it is a state of affairs she wanted, and therefore does not fit the formula for the adversative (and reflexive) get passive. Therefore, I claim that none of the adversative passives encode these features:

Something bad happened to Jane (X) that she wanted  
because someone else (Y) did something  
that Jane wanted Y to do

The full semantic representation of the reflexive adversative passive has instead this form:

Jane got herself fired.

Something bad happened to this person (X)  
because someone else (Y) did something  
because X had done something  
X could've not done this  
because of which it wouldn't have happened  
It can be thought of as if X wanted it to happen  
because of this

As a result of the combined effect of all these components, this construction lends itself to expressions of irony and satire with ease:

21. "The Sioux is about to get itself killed off." (A comment on the warlike behaviour of this American Indian tribe.)

22. "If I put the stereo on at that time of night, I'd get myself killed."

4.5.2 'Beneficial' Get Passives with a Person as the Undergoer

(1) THE NON-REFLEXIVE 'BENEFICIAL' GET-PASSIVE:

$N_p$  got  $V_{Tr}$ ...ed.  
Jane got promoted.

The causal role of the subject is manifested in a completely different way in the non-reflexive beneficial get passive: With reference to the first example, the subject, 'Jane', is characterized as wanting a certain state of affairs to come about, and consequently trying to cause it in the attempt to induce someone else (the external agent) to act in her benefit.

Significantly, it does not encode that the subject actually succeeded in doing this, unlike the reflexive form - Jane got herself promoted - where intentional causation is an explicit rather than hinted component of the meaning. (Jane did something, which caused someone else to act in her behalf and bring about the desired state of affairs.)

Robin Lakoff has shown convincingly (although she hasn't separated out the two kinds of constructions - adversative and beneficial) that in this get passive, due to the intentional nature of the subject's role, certain adverbial modifiers, infinitival clauses and appositional nouns are excluded when they refer to the action of the agent or the agent alone. Similarly, the be passive is excluded when these elements refer to intention on the part of the subject. Here, only get is permissible. (Lakoff, 1971:156; her numbers)

19. a. Mary got shot on purpose, \*the bastards.  
b. Mary was shot on purpose, the bastards.
18. a. Radicals must get arrested to prove their machismo.  
b. ?Radicals must be arrested to prove their machismo.
19. c. Radicals must be exterminated ruthlessly.  
d. ?Radicals must get exterminated ruthlessly.

(It should be noted that (19a) and (18a) are not adversative passives - the subject desires the state of affairs to be brought about.) Clearly, in the get passives, intention is attributed to the subject (Mary/the radicals wanted it to happen). Therefore, the following representation is proposed:

Jane got promoted.

Something good happened to this person (X) (her promotion)  
because someone else (Y) did something (her employer)  
that X wanted Y to do  
X had done something (worked hard, requested or hinted  
at a promotion)  
because X wanted it to happen  
Y could've done it because of that

I use the component "Y (the external agent) could've done it because of that (Jane's action)" to show that the subject's action is not necessarily the cause of the agent acting for her benefit to bring about the state of affairs she wants (her promotion), unlike the semantic representation of the reflexive passive where it is explicitly stated as the cause.

This get passive expresses that although the desired state of affairs eventuated, it may have been due to other reasons - in this example - we can imagine that perhaps Jane's employers disliked the other candidates, so they chose her instead. Thus, the

construction is vague as to the exact cause of the agent's action, and this is appropriately reflected in the semantic representation by the last component: "Y (the agent) could've done it because of that".

Again, the causal role of the subject, explicated by the components: "Jane had done something because she wanted it to happen", is responsible for any inferences made by the speaker about the subject. In contrast to the adversative passives, this inference may be either of a negative or positive nature:

23. Jane got examined by a Macquarie St specialist! (What good news!)
24. Mary got admitted to Harvard! (Isn't she lucky!)
25. John got promoted instead of me, the ingratiating...

This get passive is often conducive to a hint of subterfuge or scheming on the part of the subject, as a possible inference. This explains why the following example is not likely to be found with get as the auxiliary:

26. Einstein  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{was} \\ \text{\cancel{g}ot} \end{array} \right\}$  awarded a Nobel Prize.

If get is used, it has this implication: It would seem that the goal of Einstein's research was to win a Nobel Prize (he did his research because he wanted to win it). The use of get is thus conditioned by the speaker's intentions.

Similarly, if the speaker wants to indicate some kind of disapproval of a person who appears to have been 'blessed' by good fortune, the get passive can be used effectively to make the inference that this desirable state of affairs only seems to be

purely 'good luck', since it encodes the subject's attempt to play a causal role in bringing it about.

In the following examples, if the speaker wants to cast aspersions over the reasons for success of these various political figures, then get matches perfectly all the requirements to make this inference, in contrast to be which is neutral in this respect.

27. Napoleon { was } crowned Emperor.  
                  { got }

28. The Trades' Union President { was } selected  
  { got }  
as the Labour Party candidate for a blue ribbon seat in  
Victoria, of course.

29. Deng Xiaoping { was } rehabilitated again, after having  
                                  { got }  
been purged twice from the Chinese Communist Party.

On the other hand, that this negative inference cannot be regarded as a semantic invariant of the meaning of this get passive construction either is clear from other cases where extralinguistic information is available:<sup>7</sup>

30. John got elected president.

There is not necessarily an overtone of 'devious strategy' or 'behind the scenes' work here, since the subject's prior actions, for example, a pre-election campaign, are of a conventionally-expected nature, unlike the strongly pejorative nuance which arises from the reflexive form:

---

<sup>7</sup> This discussion of the inferential possibilities of the get passive owes much to discussion with Avery Andrews.



31. John got himself elected president. (He rigged the voting system.)

The case is similar for the following examples:

32. I got paid yesterday.  
33. We got invited to the Chinese Embassy for a banquet!  
34. Jane got chosen to lead the delegation!

Although the attitude expressed towards the subject is an inference rather than a semantic invariant, the get passive enables the speaker to say something either 'good' or 'bad' about the subject concomitantly, whereas this choice is not available for the be passive, simply because the latter lacks the components referring to the causal role of the subject.

(ii) THE REFLEXIVE 'BENEFICIAL' GET PASSIVE

N<sub>P</sub> got + reflexive pronoun V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.  
Jane got herself promoted.

In the reflexive form of the beneficial passive, an unspecified action of the subject is encoded as the explicit cause of the agent's subsequent action (equally unspecified as to its nature), responsible for the good fortune.

Intentional causation on the part of the subject is very clear: Compare the following examples to their corresponding be passives:

35. Napoleon { was  
got himself } crowned Emperor.  
36. The Revolutionary Council { was  
got itself } elected.

37. Einstein { was  
got himself } awarded the Nobel Prize.
38. The Queen { was  
got herself } invited to tour Australia.
39. Ayatollah Khomeini { was  
got himself } christened spiritual  
leader of Iran.

In this construction, in contrast to the non-reflexive passives, a pejorative nuance is conspicuous, especially in the examples above. A negative inference about the subject is easily made due to the explicit rather than hinted causal role of the subject. Again, it is only an inference rather than a semantic invariant, as the following examples bear out:

40. We got ourselves put on the waiting list for a new house!
41. I got myself enrolled in an exclusive drama school!

Hence, the pejorative nuance is not formalised as a component in the semantic structure of the reflexive beneficial get passive.

With these considerations in mind, a semantic representation of this form is proposed:

Jane got herself promoted.

Something good happened to this person (X)  
because someone else (Y) did something  
that X wanted Y to do  
because X had done something  
because X wanted it to happen

4.5.3 Get Passives with an Inanimate Subject

(i) THE 'ADVERSATIVE' GET PASSIVE WITH AN INANIMATE SUBJECT

(N<sub>P</sub>'s) N<sub>IN</sub> got V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.

Jane's bike got stolen.

A similar polarisation into adversative and beneficial exists for the get passive with inanimate subjects, although it has no reflexive form.

The affected entity in this construction is not the inanimate subject, but rather the person who owns it, or else stands in a relationship to this object equivalent to that of ownership. In other words, the topic of this get passive is not the grammatical subject (as is the case for the previously-discussed constructions with personal subjects) but the underlying 'owner', which may or may not be overtly expressed. To clarify this point, consider the following example:

42. The cricket pitch got torn up when they played football on it.

This get passive construction is most successfully used when it is clear who is affected by this state of affairs, for example, the manager of the cricket ground (but not a cricket fan - see below). Similarly,

43. Three telephone boxes got smashed up outside that post office.

is most effectively used when spoken by those responsible for them, for example, personnel from Telecom, but not by a user of public telephones. This is represented by:

Something happened to this thing (Y) (telephone boxes)  
which can be thought of as something bad that happened  
to this person (X) (those responsible for the upkeep)  
Because someone else did something (e.g. a vandal)  
(Y can be thought of as X's Y)

The adversative passive with an inanimate subject also  
encodes an identical component to the non-reflexive adversative  
passive:

X could've done something else  
because of which this wouldn't have happened

The ability on the part of an 'owner' to prevent misfortune, is  
equally integral to the meaning:

44. Jane's bike got stolen yesterday. (She always forgets to  
lock it up.)
45. (Manager of a cricket ground:) The cricket pitch got  
torn up. (I shouldn't have given permission to the  
football club to use it.)
46. (Personnel from Telecom:) Three telephone boxes got  
smashed up outside that post office. (We shouldn't have  
built them in such an unprotected area.)

From non-linguistic considerations, the last two examples  
may be unfortunate events equally for cricket fans and public  
telephone users as for those responsible for their upkeep, however,  
a kind of ownership relation is not usually conceivable for the  
former group. Neither is it likely that such states of affairs can  
be thought of as being prevented by those not 'responsible' for the  
entity in question. A be passive is more likely in the latter cases.

The complete semantic representation for the adversative  
passive with an inanimate subject is presented below:

It was her last two movies which got shredded by the critics.

Something happened to this thing (Y) (last two movies)  
which can be thought of as something bad that happened  
to this person (X) ('her')  
because someone else did something (the critics)  
X could've done something else (e.g. made better movies)  
because of which this wouldn't have happened  
(Y can be thought of as X's Y)

(ii) THE 'BENEFICIAL' GET-PASSIVE WITH AN INANIMATE SUBJECT:

(Np's) N<sub>IN</sub> got V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.

Jane's bike got fixed.

Similarly, the topic of this get passive is the person and 'owner' who is affected by the resulting state of affairs and not the inanimate entity itself. The semantic properties are otherwise identical to the non-reflexive beneficial passive: A state of affairs desired by the 'owner' is brought about by another person's actions, which the 'owner' wanted to cause. Cases where it is not clear who the 'owner' is as in (47a), or where an 'owner' is inconceivable as in (48) are very unlikely to take form as a get passive. This is also the case for verbs of 'creation', exemplified by (49):

47. a. A proposal { was } accepted.  
          { got }

b. Jane's proposal { was } accepted.  
                  { got }

48. The Blue Mountains { were } crossed in 1813.  
                          { got }

49. The steam engine { was } invented by James Watt.  
                      { got }

In the initial discussion, I showed that the subject must refer to a specific image in the mind of the speaker before a passive event can be predicated of it which is another reason why (47a) is unacceptable. This was also shown to explain the restriction on verbs of 'creation', as in (49), where the entity referred to by the subject comes into being as a result of the passive event described. In Lakoff's article, there seems to be a counterexample to my claim (1971:154; her numbering):

13. A shoddy house like that can get built in 10 days.

This sentence is acceptable for the following reasons: Despite the presence of the indefinite article, the addition of 'like that' makes the reference specific. Moreover, the statement is generic, referring to a class - the class of 'shoddy' houses, and in such also refers to a specific concept without violating the constraint.

The semantic representation of the beneficial get passive with an inanimate subject is presented below:

Jane's bike got fixed.

Something happened to this thing (Y) (the bike)  
which can be thought of as something good that happened  
to this person (X) (Jane)  
because someone else (Z) did something that Jane wanted  
(Z) to do (e.g. a mechanic)  
Jane had done something (e.g. asked for it to be mended)  
because she wanted it to happen  
Z could've done it because of that  
(Y can be thought of as X's Y)

In conclusion, it does not depend on the meaning of a particular passive verb, whether a get passive is interpreted as 'beneficial' or 'adversative'. In other words, verbs occurring in get passives cannot be divided into an 'adversative' set and a

'beneficial' set. The speaker's intentions, aided by the context, determine which of the two interpretations is appropriate:

50. Jane got photographed dancing with Prince Charles.

The get passive in (50) could either be construed as 'adversative' for the 'Jane' who is supposed to be an uncompromising anarchist, or 'beneficial' for the 'Jane' who is a socialite. This example is not a 'borderline' case. It has two interpretations and the speaker makes it clear which one is intended.

Thus, it is not merely a matter of the semantic nature of lexical items, but rather the semantic representation of each construction as a whole which predicts the suitable interpretation for each speaker (given a context) and subsequently, which verbs are not likely to be compatible with the meaning of each construction.

Moreover, the several components of meaning in the semantic representation of each get passive are all mutually interdependent to the effect that none of the components can be deleted, nor any of the constructions collapsed without losing crucial semantic distinctions.

Any characterization of the get passive which does no more than to describe it as 'adversative' or 'showing responsibility on the part of the subject' barely skims the surface of a complex of underlying semantic structures, which can only be explicated adequately in terms of several distinct though related constructions. Moreover, I have shown that only one type of these constructions can properly be labelled 'adversative', this term being selected as an abbreviation from a choice of several components of meaning which form the hard semantic core of this construction.

The different way in which the subject's causal role is encoded is contingent upon the polarization of the get passive into 'adversative' and 'beneficial' as well as upon its syntactic form - whether reflexive or non-reflexive. The frequent negative inference made by the speaker about the subject is especially clear for both kinds of reflexive passives. This was explained as a function of the explicit causal role of the subject in the sequence of events grammaticalized by the 'adversative' and 'beneficial' reflexive get passives. In the non-reflexive constructions, the causal role of the subject is hinted at, rather than stated. Consequently, any inferences the speaker wishes to make are correspondingly more subtle in nature.

The polarisation of passive events into either fortunate or unfortunate and the possibility of making an inference of a negative or positive nature about the subject due to the latter's causal involvement are the features of the semantic structure of the get passive that not only set it apart from the be passive but also account for the emotive overtones that grammarians have been sensitive to in the past and incorrectly attributed to the colloquial nature of get.



APPENDIX:

In earlier drafts of this paper, there was one extra component appended to the semantic representations of all the get passive constructions. This was of the form:

Something bad can be said about this person (the subject)  
because of that

(where "that" refers to the particular kind of causal involvement of the subject).

The negative inference is particularly clear for the adversative passives, especially in the reflexive form:

John got (himself) kicked in the shins for saying that.

This was the earlier form of the semantic representation for the adversative get passive:

John got kicked in the shins.

Something bad happened to John  
because someone else did something  
John could've done something else  
because of which this wouldn't have happened  
Something bad can be said about John  
because of that

The main argument against this last component took this form: In examples such as

My Jewish friend, Rafael, went to Israel and got drafted.

the speaker is often in sympathy with the plight of the subject and is not saying anything "bad" about "Rafael". First of all, to counter such an objection, I don't think it is necessarily contradictory for the speaker to remain sympathetic to the subject's predicament in the real world situation while conveying that the subject could have prevented the misfortune at the same time (by means of a get passive). (Why did Rafael go to Israel when he knew such a risk was involved?)

Moreover, the component "Something bad can be said about this person because of that", as part of the semantic metalanguage, cannot be paraphrased in ordinary language to mean that the subject was a 'bad person', although perhaps, this explains why many objected to its presence in the semantic representation. In this example, we can imagine that the speaker uses the get passive to convey that Rafael should have been wiser to the facts or that his travelling plans were ill-conceived (and so on) even though the speaker may be genuinely upset about the situation. In the final stages, however, it seemed advisable to leave this particular component out of the semantic representation since the components representing the causal role of the subject, especially in the two reflexive get passives, clearly accounted for the negative inference.

\*\*\*\*\*

CONCLUSION TO PART I

In Part I, the view was upheld that the bei passive in its traditional and colloquial use is an adversity passive. This view was supported by several different points in the argument, these being:

- (i) the restricted usage of the bei passive in comparison to the neutral topic-comment constructions which also express the passive meaning
- (ii) the historical consideration of the evolution of the verb bei 'cover' or 'suffer' to become used as the syntactic exponent of the passive, and most importantly
- (iii) the synchronic semantic analysis where it was shown that adversity is an inherent semantic property of the bei passive in that even for verbs which express either fortunate or neutral events when considered as single lexical items, on occurring in the bei passive, the overall interpretation remains nevertheless one of adversity. The fact that the bei passive serves as a warning when it is used in the negative form of the imperative mood (to the effect "Don't have misfortune befall you") also acted as a piece of supporting evidence.

A subsidiary topic to the argument in favour of considering bei an adversative passive was the evaluation of two other methods of analysis - the verb classification method and the Case Grammar approach. It was pointed out that all the data cannot be accounted for by looking at co-occurring verbs alone and categorizing them into either semantic classes or as 'disposal' or 'transitive verbs'. Counter examples in the form of verbs of

happening and experiencer (Psych. Movement) verbs were presented at this point. Accounting for the data in terms of case roles permitted in the subject position proved to be inadequate to the same extent. Some examples with Benefactive Case nouns in subject position were shown to be acceptable despite claims to the contrary with respect to this case.

Following upon the justification of adversity as an intrinsic feature of this passive, the other general semantic properties of the bei passive were examined. I claimed that there were three further requirements of interpretation for every bei passive: an "identifiable" undergoer, a syntactically overt agent and the completive nature of the passive event.

"Identifiability" of the undergoer was seen as a pre-requisite to the use of the bei passive in that the speaker could not otherwise predicate any event of the subject NP unless they were able to think of it or bring it readily to mind at the moment of speaking. The presence of this feature results in the exclusion of the objects of verbs of creation and all cognate objects from subject position. The concept of "identifiability" was claimed to be a refinement of the description of the subject NP as either "definite" or "specific".

Secondly, the postulation of a component of completiveness was justified by the inability of modals, negative markers and durative aspect markers to occur in the predicate of the bei passive as they violated this semantic requirement by expressing either that the event had not taken place yet, but could happen in the future or that it had never taken place at all or that it was ongoing at the moment of speech.

The argument for the third requirement of the overt expression of the agent was a corollary to the argument for the polysemy of the bei passive and constituted a second claim made in Part I following on from the claim of adversity, namely that the general bei passive structure subsumes two distinct types of passive construction:

- (i) the traditional bei passive which retains the semantic features described above and
- (ii) the Europeanized bei passive which has lost the features of adversity and individualizable agent, being a modified form of the traditional bei passive which arose from the impact of European languages on Chinese in the form of translated works, and is confined to the written language.

The Europeanized passive may be further sub-divided into two subconstructions - one being agentless and the other requiring a collective and thus non-individualizable agent. These two passive constructions were shown to occupy a different semantic space to that of the traditional bei passive which is itself four-ways polysemous, the different meanings grammaticalised depending on the kinds of entities and events permitted to co-occur with each sub-construction.

Following upon the division into these two main types of passive construction, the bei passive with a person as the under-goer, the bei passive of possessions and the bei passive with a natural force were postulated and discussed and their semantic components justified. Finally the bei passive of bodily effect was singled out for in-depth analysis due to its unusual syntactic feature of a postverbal noun and the semantic consequences of this.

In the case of this fourth subconstruction of the bei passive, it was shown that the postverbal noun always denotes a part of the body and moreover one which is both tangible and functional; that this NP may not be modified by adjectives or possessive and demonstrative pronouns, and that the construction serves as a part-whole identifying expression with the resultant state of the body part affected by the event being viewed as causing an adverse state of affairs for the person. Furthermore, the passive of bodily effect was shown to be semantically distinct from the regular bei passive with parts of the body as the subject NP.

In the final chapter, the polysemy of the get passive in English was investigated. It was seen that the get passive, unlike the bei passive dichotomizes into subconstructions expressing benefit and subconstructions expressing adversity for the undergoer. An argument was presented in favour of the postulation of six distinct subconstructions of the get passive.

The adversative nature of three of the subconstructions in the get passive complex linked this analysis to the preceding analysis of the bei passive while the feature of its colloquial use links it to Part II as well where the colloquial passives formed by rang and jiao are the subject of investigation. In particular, the non-reflexive adversative get passive will be seen to have its counter-part in Chinese in the rang passive, both being considered to be passives of avoidable events in this presentation.

PART II

CAUSATIVE AND PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

FORMED BY RANG AND JIAO

0 INTRODUCTION TO CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN CHINESE

That passive and causative constructions in Chinese share the basic syntactic pattern of NP-RANG(JIAO)-NP-VP probably accounts for the fact that apart from T.N. Nikitina's article "Causative and Passive Constructions in Chinese" (1958), virtually no analysis has been undertaken of the use of rang and jiao as causatives, not to mention as passives. Typically, their causative use is either subsumed under discussion of the verb shi 'cause', for example, in Jiang Tian (1980); Guo Derun (1980) and Lü and Zhu (1952), or else the observation is made that rang and jiao have at least two further meanings of 'allow' (or 'let someone do as they please') and 'cause' apart from their use forming passive constructions (Ding Shengshu 1979: 100; Lü 1981: 267, 405).

In a way, the latter observation is an underlying recognition of the use of rang and jiao in forming both intentional and unintentional types of causatives. Thus, such analyses can be understood to implicitly separate rang and jiao into several different constructions of both passive and causative types through the listing or mentioning of their different meanings. Nonetheless, despite this classificatory approach, rang and jiao are given the same treatment, no differentiation of their usage being made.

When rang and jiao are explicitly discussed by noting their use in sentences with the meaning of 'command' or 'cause', then we find - not a discussion of causative semantics - but rather random though observant remarks of the kind "the second predicate expresses the goal or result of the first one" (Jiang Tian 1980: 231).

A detailed syntactic and semantic analysis of rang and jiao constructions with both causative and passive meanings is presented in the following five sections. - Although passive and causative constructions in Chinese are identical in their basic syntactic form of NP-RANG(JIAO)-NP-VP, they can nevertheless be successfully differentiated according to both their more complex syntactic behaviour and more significantly by their semantic structure.

In this introductory section, the question of whether rang and jiao causatives may be classified as serial verb constructions is considered first of all and then a third complex of causative constructions formed by shi is briefly discussed for the purposes of later comparison with rang and jiao causatives. The shi causatives, however, do not form any passive constructions.

#### 0.1 ARE RANG AND JIAO CAUSATIVES SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS?

In grammar books of Chinese, jiao and rang are typically classified as forming pivotal constructions (jianyushi) of the kind which express 'ordering' (Chao 1968: 126; Jiang Tian 1980: 232; Tang Qiyun 1980: 83). Thus, the causative use of rang and jiao is described mainly in order to illustrate the syntax of the pivotal construction in Chinese, not to describe the semantics of causative constructions. Pivotal constructions are defined by these grammarians as sentences where the object of the first verb acts as the subject of the second verb. The syntactic constituent with this double function is consequently labelled as the pivot nominal:



NOUN PHRASE	VERB	NOUN PHRASE	VERB PHRASE
Subject	(rang)	Pivot	
	(jiao)		

1.        Wo        jiao        ta        bie xie zheizhong wenzhang.  
           I        tell            him       don't write this:kind article  
           I told him not to write this sort of article.

Is the pivotal construction a type of serial verb construction then?

The serial verb construction (liandongshi) is typically defined as one where there may be two or more verb phrases, none of which have any conjunctions intervening and all of which are predicated of the first syntactic subject (Ding Shengshu 1979: 112; Jiang Tian 1980: 224; Schachter 1974: 252-3):

- |  |             |             |             |                |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
|  | NOUN PHRASE | VERB PHRASE | VERB PHRASE | VERB PHRASE... |
|  | Subject     |             |             |                |
2.        Zuo Xiansheng        qu        da dianhua        jiao che  
           (name)            go            telephone        call cab  
           Mr Zuo went to make a phone call to call a taxi.

Serial verb constructions thus contain no pivot nominal which serves the semantic role, for example, of acting as the 'causee' in some types of causative constructions such as ta 'he' in (1). That is, pivotal constructions contain two NPs which can be considered to be the subject of their following VPs, whereas serial verb constructions have only one such NP.

Schachter (1974: 257) states the case for serial verb constructions in an even stronger form:

[S]erial constructions ... always have exactly one subject noun phrase, and this noun phrase always precedes the first verb phrase ...

It is interesting to find that in contrast to this, Li and Thompson (1981: 594; 607-610) treat causative sentences as a subtype of the serial verb construction, the latter being defined as

[A] sentence that contains two or more verb phrases or clauses juxtaposed without any marker indicating what the relationship is between them ... there are many sentences that all have the same form ... but ... convey different types of messages because of the meanings of the verbs involved and the relationships that are understood to hold between them. (1981: 594).

This treatment is forced to be so broad in its generalisations, in order to include four different types of syntactic constructions, that the semantic and syntactic features of the kind to be proposed in this analysis are necessarily precluded. For example, when the verb phrase in a serial verb construction contains a noun which is semantically the patient of the verb, it may never be regarded as the subject of the following verb phrase as opposed to the case for the pivot nominal in causative constructions:

3.        Dajia    suibian    mai    xie    dongxi    chi    ba!  
          everyone casual    buy    some    thing    eat    RP

How about everyone buying some things to eat, if they want.

In (3), dajia 'everyone' is the subject of both mai 'buy' and chi 'eat'. It is not possible to interpret xie dongxi 'some things' as the subject of the verb chi 'eat'.

In contrast to the serial verb construction, the pivotal construction cannot be defined as having the syntactic form of NP-VP-VP(VP) as the causative verb never forms a larger verb phrase - neither with the following pivot nominal nor with any other kind

of syntactic constituent. For example, the pivot nominal in (4) does not form a semantic unit or VP with the preceding causative verb as does the V-NP unit mai xie dongxi 'buy some things' in (3):

- |    |                        |                 |
|----|------------------------|-----------------|
| 4. | <u>Wo rang ta zou.</u> | *rang ta        |
|    | I RANG he leave.       | Causative Pivot |
|    |                        | Verb Nominal    |
|    | I had him go.          |                 |

In other words, we cannot analyse (4) as NP-VP-VP as we do for (3) but only as NP-Causative Verb-NP-VP. Similarly, xie dongxi chi 'some things to eat' extracted from (3) is not an independently occurring syntactic unit unlike the combination of the pivot nominal with its following verb phrase which may stand as a complete sentence in its own right: Ta zou "He goes". This distinction is lost by classifying pivotal constructions in with serial verb constructions, as these constructions represent in fact two completely different syntactic phenomena.

A second characteristic of serial verb constructions which is also not a feature of causative constructions in Chinese is that all the verbs in the sentence must agree in either tense, aspect or mood, defined by Schachter (1974: 270) in the following way:

[T]here is no independent choice of tense or aspect for the several verb phrases that occur in a serialized construction. Instead, once the tense-aspect of the first verb is specified, that of all subsequent verbs in the serial constructions is automatically determined.

In causative constructions in Chinese, only the second verb (the main verb) and not the causative verb may take aspectual marking. This is so despite the fact that jiao and rang both occur

elsewhere as independent verbs where they fully retain their verbal characteristics (v. Section 1.1 and Section 2.1 below). Compare (5) with (6), the latter being the only acceptable sentence:

5.           \*Shuji rang (jiao)-le ta chuli zhejian shi.  
secretary CAUS       COM she handle this:CL matter

6.           Shuji rang (jiao) ta chuli-le zhejian shi.  
secretary CAUS       she handle:COM this:CL matter  
The party secretary had (made) her deal with this matter.

Thus, on forming causative constructions, rang and jiao lose their verbal characteristics, a feature which has also been remarked upon by Nikitina (1958: 212):

All three verbs jiao, rang and shi (shide) in auxiliary function, cannot occur either as independent predicates or without a second verb and cannot take any verbal markers - aspectual temporal or resultative, that is, they lose not only the semantic but also the grammatical properties of a verb.

(Here, Nikitina's "auxiliary function" refers to the causative usage of these verbs.)

From these two pieces of evidence, I conclude that the rang and jiao causative constructions cannot be classified as serial verb constructions as suggested by Li and Thompson (1981: Chapter 21), and I will treat them as a separate syntactic phenomenon forthwith.

#### 0.2 CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FORMED BY SHI:

It was remarked upon above that the rang and jiao causative constructions are often subsumed under the discussion of the verb shi 'cause' in Chinese grammar books. There is a third

complex of causative constructions formed by the verb shi which is similar to bei in the feature of mainly being used in written rather than spoken Chinese. As Nikitina points out (1958: 212):

It [shi] is used in newspaper jargon, in political literature and in literary works of the type where colloquial language is totally absent.

Shi is not however used to form passive constructions and thus will not constitute a major topic of analysis in this presentation. For the purposes of comparison with rang and jiao causatives, let us briefly examine its semantic structure before proceeding to the analysis of rang and jiao.

0.2.1 Comparison of Shi with Rang and Jiao

The basic meanings of shi as an independent verb are 'send' or 'use':

7.        Shi            ren      qu      dating    xiaoxi.  
          send            s.o.    go      enquire   news

Send someone to go and enquire about the news.

8.        Ni   de    bi      jie    wo    shi-shi.  
          you GEN pen    lend me    use-TENT

Let me use your pen for a while.

As expected, shi retains its fully verbal characteristics with these two meanings, for example, reduplication of the verb in (8) above to render the tentative aspect or the use of the aspect marker -zhe in (9) below to render the durative aspect:

9.        Qianzi    wo      zheng    shi-zhe    ne!  
          pliers    I right:now use-DUR    RP

I'm using the pliers right now!

Distinct from the rang and jiao causatives, the three shi causative constructions to be examined below are all either unintentional or agentless event causatives. This is identical to the situation of the periphrastic causatives formed by cause in English. All the subconstructions of the cause and shi causatives are so defined in that the new state of affairs or event is caused either unintentionally through a person's action or behaviour or by another prior event that does not involve an agent.<sup>1</sup>

In the first construction with shi, both the syntactic subject and the pivot nominal denote persons:

	NOUN PHRASE	SHI	NOUN PHRASE	VERB PHRASE
	Subject		Pivot	
10.	<u>Ta</u>	<u>shi</u>	<u>wo</u>	<u>hen gaoxing (shiwang).</u>
	He caused me to be very happy (disappointed). <sup>2</sup>			

The fact that there are no intentional causatives formed by shi provides one major contrast with rang and jiao causatives:

In the intentional causatives formed by rang and jiao, the person denoted by the pivot nominal is 'caused' to carry out an action which the causer (denoted by the syntactic subject) wants the former to do. Thus, the intention to bring about the causative event is attributed to the causer, not the causee. Furthermore, in such intentional causatives, the causee is always agentive ex definitione. Compare the intentional rang causative in (11) to the

---

1 These constructions formed by cause are summarised in the Appendix of my Honours thesis, p.9.

2 A fluent English translation of (10) would be "He made me very happy (disappointed)". I use 'cause' however, in all the translations of SHI causatives to keep these distinct from the JIAO causatives, translated in all cases by 'make'.

unacceptable shi causative in (12). Both have the same predicate, containing the verb mai 'buy': (c.f. Sections 1.2.1 and 2.2.1 below).

11.            Wo rang ta mai neiben shu.  
              I    RANG    he    buy    that:CL    book.  
  
              I had him buy that book.

12.            \*Wo shi ta mai neiben shu.  
              I    SHI    he    buy    that:CL    book.

In the shi causatives, the person denoted by the pivot nominal is never an agent but rather always the undergoer of the causative event, coming into a new state of affairs as the result of it. Thus, the shi causatives only co-occur with stative and experiential predicates, demonstrated by the unacceptability of (12) with an action predicate.<sup>3</sup>

Not all stative and experiential predicates are acceptable in unintentional causative constructions however. Teng Shou-hsin (1975: 139) claims that in the case of the jiao causative, what he terms "active States" - states of being which "specify voluntary involvement of the Patient" are excluded as opposed to "passive States" where "the emotions are formed within the Patient due to external causation". Hence, Teng classifies xihuan 'like' and teng 'be fond of' as active State verbs and pa 'be frightened' and houhui 'regret' as passive State verbs.

The sensitivity of the jiao causative to this semantic feature is shown by two examples from Teng's set of data (his numbering and translation):

---

3    Teng (1975: 62) also points out that the role "Agent" cannot occur with an Action verb in the main predicate (for which he uses the term "lower sentence").

Jiao causative with an Active State verb:

- (2) b. \*Pao-che jiao ta hen xihuan.  
 sports car make he very like

Jiao causative with a Passive State verb:

- (2) c. Mingtiande kaoshi jiao ta hen haipa.  
 tomorrow's exam make he very afraid  
 (Tomorrow's exam makes him very scared.)

This being the situation which holds for the unintentional jiao causative, what do we find in the case of shi causatives? - Due to the fact that Teng does not distinguish between the causative uses of jiao, rang or shi, he draws the one general conclusion (1975: 140): "The Goal of 'active' States cannot function as Causer ..., while that of 'passive' States can." Here, he also explicitly classifies jiao and shi as Causer verbs and "Goal" is defined as the recipient of the feelings (1975: 130).

This rule does not apply, however, to the shi causative in which experiential predicates containing the verb xihuan 'like' may occur. Below two actual literary examples are given which use this verb in the shi causative:

14. Lang biancheng-le gou, yexing shi xiaoshi-le,  
 wolf change:COM dog, wild:nature be disappear:COM  
dan zhi shi shi muren xihuan.  
 but only be SHI herdsmen like

When the dog evolved out of the wolf, its wild nature was lost, but this only caused the herdsmen to like it.

(- from the writings of Lü Xun, quoted in Ding Shengshu 1970: 119).



15. Wo shenshang you yidian bianhua dou shi wo haipa,  
my body:on have a:bit change all SHI I afraid,  
shi wo xihuan, shi wo momingqimiao.  
SHI I like, SHI I confused.

The changes which my body underwent made me afraid, made me pleased, made me confused.

(-from the writings of Lao She, quoted in Nikitina 1958: 213.)

Secondly, the verb xihuan 'like' may occur in both the unintentional rang and jiao causatives, providing counter-evidence to Teng's hypothesis:

16. Zheichang da yu zhen jiao ren xihuan.  
this:CL big rain really JIAO one like  
This heavy rain pleases one.

17. Zhei haizi zhen rang ren xihuan.  
This child really RANG one like  
This child really pleases one.

However, in the unintentional rang and jiao causatives, xihuan 'like' is only found in the exclamation form of these causatives with the intensifier zhen 'really' and the generic ren 'one' or 'you' [v. Section 2.2.2].

Despite this qualification, Teng's hypothesis needs to be refined: The situation is rather that inanimate entities such as the paoche 'sportscar' of Teng's example (2b) cannot act as the cause of an event whereas events or "happenings" such as zheichang da yu 'rainstorm' in (16) and persons or "animate entities" as in (17) may.

Apart from this refinement, Teng's hypothesis holds, since states of being which cannot be understood as externally

caused are patently unsuited to a shi causative construction, as shown by Teng's example (8b); not to mention both the rang and jiao experiencer causatives as will be seen in the later discussions.

- 8b.        \*Li Xiaojie shi ta hen ke-lian.  
          Li Miss cause he very pity  
          (\*Miss Li makes him pity.)

The shi causatives contrast with the unintentional rang and jiao causatives in that the former are not restricted to experiential predicates denoting feelings [v. Section 1.2.3 and Section 2.2.2]. Sentence (18) illustrates this point:

18.        Zhang San shi (\*rang) (\*jiao) ta  
          (name)        SHI (\*RANG) (\*JIAO) he  
  
          shu le shi kuai qian.  
          lose COM ten:CL money  
          Zhang San caused him to lose ten dollars.  
          (\*Zhang San had (made) him lose ten dollars.)

The subject of the shi causative may also be syntactically complex, for example, consisting of an S-V clause:<sup>4</sup>

13.        Ta yangzi hen qiguai shi wo xia-le yitiao.  
          his appearance very strange SHI I frighten:COM one:CL  
          His appearance was so strange that it gave me a start.

This syntactic variation of the basic shi causative is highly suited to its semantic structure in that it makes possible the unambiguous interpretation of unintentional causation on the part of the subject.

---

4        Lü and Zhu (1952: 108) also recognize that a preceding clause may act as "the notional subject" of a shi sentence. Teng (1975: 62) states that "causer ... can be a whole sentence".

Let us now turn to the proposed semantic representations for three grammatical constructions formed by shi.

The first causative construction with shi grammaticalizes the meaning explicated by the semantic formula presented below:

(i) Stative Shi Causative of Unintentional Causation

NP <sub>P</sub> (VP) SHI	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP	STATIVE
Subject	Pivot		
Person A	Person B		
Cause	Undergoer		

(i) Ta de chengjiu shi wo hen shiwang.  
 he GEN results SHI I very disappointed  
 His results caused me to be very disappointed.

(ii) Ta shi Zhang San shu-le shikuai qian.  
 he cause (name) lose:COM ten:CL money  
 He caused Zhang San to lose ten dollars.

(iii) \*Zhang San shi wo zuo zhejian shi. (\*action predicate)  
 (name) SHI I do this:CL matter

(iv) Ta de jishu shi wo hen peifu.  
 she GEN skill SHI I very admire  
 Her expertise caused me to admire her very much.

Person B came to be in a certain state  
 because of something that can be said about person A  
 that B became aware of  
 not because anyone wanted this to happen.

The unintentional nature of the causation on the part of the person denoted by the subject (person A) is formulated in terms of a new state of affairs coming about for person B, not because anyone wanted this to happen.

The second shi causative is also restricted to encoding the arising of a new state of affairs for its undergoer - the person denoted by the pivot nominal. In contrast to the preceding construction however, an agentless event is viewed as the cause of this new state of affairs rather than a prior event or state of affairs involving another person as the unintentional cause. Thus, this causative involves only one entity - the undergoer of the causative event. The syntactic schema and semantic roles for this construction take the following form:

NP <sub>P</sub>	(VP)	SHI	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP	STATIVE
Subject			Pivot		
			Person B		
Cause			Undergoer		

19.        Zhei xiaoxi shi ta hen gaoxing  
 This news    SHI she    very happy  
 This news made her very happy.

With an agentless event as the cause, it is even less semantically plausible that the person denoted by the pivot nominal be 'caused' to be the agent of the subsequent event. This semantic property is borne out by the data which shows conclusively that the 'causee' is not an agent. Compare (20) with (21):

20.        \*Waitou you ren shuo hua, shi ta likai.  
 Outside there:be people talk, SHI he leave

21.        Waitou you ren shuo hua, shi ta shui-bu-zhao.  
 outside there:be people talk,    SHI he sleep not: fall  
 That there were people talking outside caused him to be unable to fall asleep.<sup>5</sup>

---

5 This example is quoted from Teng (1975: 62) as well as (i) on the next page, my translations.



Person B came to be in a certain state  
because of something that can be said about place L  
that B became aware of  
not because anyone wanted this to happen.

There is also a third construction where the pivot  
nominal designates an inanimate entity or abstract phenomenon and  
not a person. This construction functions semantically to encode a  
naturally occurring phenomenon as the cause of a new state of  
affairs arising for the inanimate entity or the cause of a new state  
of affairs to arise in a certain place. This usage of shi is  
characteristic of the written language, there being no rang or jiao  
causative counterparts.

(iii) Shi Causative of Natural Phenomena

NP	(VP)	SHI	NP	VP
			IN	
Causing Event			Caused Event or State of	Affairs

22. Heibanbing shi (\*rang) meiguishu luoye.  
                                        (\*jiao)  
   black:spot:disease   SHI (\*RANG) rosebush   drop:leaves  
                                        (\*JIAO)

Black spot is causing the rosebushes to lose their leaves.

Typical examples of this causative construction are the  
long and complex sentences of scientific works:

23. Dimianshang fugai-zhe de zhiwu, shi diqiushang  
      earth:surface:on cover:DUR REL plants, SHI world:on  
lengnuan                               ganshi   gengjia   shihe renlei de xuyao.  
 changes:in:temperature moisture still:more suit mankind GEN needs.

The plants covering the surface of the earth cause the  
world's temperature and moisture to be even more suited  
to the needs of mankind.

The semantic structure of this shi causative is explicated by the formula below:

Something happened in a place  
because of something else that can be said about  
that place.

The semantics of shi causative constructions have been shown to differ from that of rang and jiao causative constructions in the following three ways:

First of all, the three shi constructions examined above all proved to belong to the unintentional or agentless type of causative. Shi causative constructions thus have no intentional or agentive counterparts for those rang and jiao causatives which display precisely these features - the speech act causatives (v. Section 1.2.1 and Section 2.2.1).

Secondly, it was pointed out that rang and jiao causatives of the unintentional or agentless type are subject to different constraints than those affecting the shi causatives. Unintentional rang and jiao causatives are restricted to experiential predicates - those which denote emotions and perception (v. Section 1.2.3 and Section 2.2.2) whereas shi causatives combine with any stative predicate encoding a new state of affairs which has arisen for the undergoer rather than the more specific one of new emotional or mental state.

Thirdly, the shi causative involving natural phenomena has no rang or jiao counterpart. Since these differing features of usage may be traced back to distinct semantic structures, it may not be inferred that rang and jiao are colloquial or informal variants of the shi causative construction. The lack of mutual substitut-

ability between any of these three causative complexes means that strictly speaking jiao and rang should not be subsumed under the discussion of shi and warrants the detailed analysis of their syntax and semantics to be presented in the next three sections.



1. RANG CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

1.1 RANG AS AN INDEPENDENT VERB

That rang can be used as an independent verb is evident from the fact that it may occur as the only verb in the sentence and that it exhibits the verbal characteristics of aspectual marking, reduplication and ability to take nominal objects [cf. Lü 1981: 404].

There are at least five different uses of the verb rang which can be traced back to its central meaning of giving away one's advantage willingly to someone else.

One of its main verbal uses is that of 'yield' or 'give in' exemplified by (1) where it takes the experiential aspect marker -guo in the first clause and the completive aspect marker -le in the second clause as well as having both 'direct' and 'indirect' objects:

1. Shangci xia qi, wo rang-guo ni liangge ma,  
last:time play chess, I yield:EXP you two:CL horse,  
zheici you rang-le ni yige ju.  
this:time again yield:COM you one:CL chariot

Last time we played chess, I yielded two horses to you;  
this time I've yielded you a chariot.

In the next example, rang has the related use of 'give in to somebody', and here it takes the durative aspect marker -zhe:

2. Meimei xiao, ni rang-zhe ta yidianr.  
younger sister small, you give:in:DUR her a:little.  
Your sister is little, so just humour her a bit.

A third extension of the meaning of rang is that of 'move out of the way', exemplified by (3) where the verb is reduplicated to give the meaning of tentative action:

3.        Che lai le, dajia rang yi rang.  
car come INC everybody move : away:TENT.

The car is about to arrive, everybody move out of the way for a while.

A fourth use of the verb rang which is of relevance to its use as an intentional causative - the speech act causative of request - is that of 'invite':

4.        Ta ba keren rang -le jinqu.  
he BA guest invite:COM enter:go

He invited the guests to go in.

As I have observed above, these several uses of the verb rang are all linked by the notion of willingly giving up or giving away one's advantage, rights or possessions to another. This central meaning of rang is also to be found in fixed phrases such as rang cha 'offer tea' and rang zuo 'give up one's seat'. Even the translation of rang in (4) as 'invite' glosses over the fact that it is derived from the specific meaning of the host standing to one side to make way for the guests to enter, apparent in (5):

5.        Yibian wang wuli rang-zhe keren,  
BOTH towards room:in invite:DUR guest,  
yibian shuo "Qing jin".  
AND say 'Please enter'.

Both standing to one side to make way for the guests to move in and saying 'Please go in'.

It will be seen that the verbal uses of rang hold certain implications for the semantic structures of the causative constructions that rang forms such as the speech act causative of request and the causatives of permission and non-interference which parallel the let causatives in English. The function of rang in forming these causative constructions then is not merely the syntactic one of serving as a causative verb but has the effect of creating causative constructions with semantic structures that are unique. Moreover the same situation applies for the use of rang in passive constructions where the relationship to the rang causatives of permission and non-interference and thus to the notion of 'let' is easily identified.

#### 1.2 CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FORMED BY RANG:

In Nikitina's article "Causative and Passive Constructions in Chinese" it is claimed that jiao and rang overlap in their causative functions, and moreover, that in some cases they are identical in meaning:

Rang is rarely used to express a forced action. However, in the case of permitted, allowed action, either jiao or rang can be used. Their function in this case is identical. It is often difficult to explain why one auxiliary verb is used rather than the other. Two sentences, identical in meaning, can have jiao used in one and rang in the other (1958: 212).

Implicit in Nikitina's analysis is that there is only one rang causative and one jiao causative. Explicit is her belief that both constructions are in most cases interchangeable.

In the following analysis it is demonstrated that there is not just one rang causative nor one jiao causative but that each comprises a complex of semantically distinct constructions.

Furthermore, it is shown that none of the rang causatives may be substituted for any of the jiao causatives without violating the context or causing a change of meaning.

In this section, six rang causatives are distinguished and analysed with reference to the English let and have causatives. They are in order of presentation:

- I Speech Act Causative of Request with RANG.
- II Speech Act Causative of Permission with RANG.
- III RANG Causative of Non-Interference in an Agentive Event.
- IV RANG Causative of Non-Interference in an Agentless Event.
- V Experiencer Causative of Unintentional Causation with RANG.
- VI Experiencer Causative of Agentless Causation with RANG.

Each construction is now discussed in turn:

#### 1.2.1 Rang Speech Act Causatives

- (i) Speech Act Causative of Request with Rang

This rang causative bears similarities to the have causative in English by which it may be appropriately translated, the have causative being of the form: Person A had Person B do something. Both constructions, English and Chinese, express a non-coercive relationship which holds between the two persons filling the roles of 'causer' and 'causee' (denoted by the syntactic subject and the pivot nominal respectively). This feature furnishes one point of contrast with the corresponding jiao causative.

The rang speech act causative of request has the syntactic form given below. This is accompanied by the specification of the semantic roles of the two entities involved:

NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>ACTION</sub>
Subject		Pivot	
Causer		Causee	

6.        Shuji            rang                    wo            shang ta nar qu yitang  
 secretary RANG                    I            up his place go one:CL  
 The party secretary had me go to his place for a visit.

Syntactically analysed, the main verb phrase may contain an intransitive verb such as qu 'go' in (6) or a transitive verb chuli 'deal with' in (7) producing two argument and three argument structures respectively:

7.        Shuji            rang            Xiao Mei chuli    -    le    zhejian shi.  
 secretary RANG                    (name)    deal:with:COM this:CL matter  
 The party secretary had Xiao Mei deal with this matter.

This is the only rang causative which permits "transitive verbs" in its predicate, with the proviso that I am defining a "transitive verb" semantically: as one which denotes an action that affects another entity.

In order to justify the claim that both causer and causee specifically denote persons and not the broader category of animate beings, first of all consider (8) where the causee is animate:

8.        ?? Zhang San rang ta de    xiao gou    guolai.  
           (name)            RANG he GEN little dog come:over  
           ?? Zhang San had his little dog come over to him.

On changing rang to jiao in order to form the speech act causative of command (discussed in Section 2.2.1 below), the completely acceptable sentence (9) is obtained:

9.            Zhang San jiao ta      de    xiao    gou    guolai.  
              (name)    JIAO he    GEN    little dog    come:over  
  
              Zhang San made his little dog come over to him.

Acceptability hinges upon the distinction between a speech act of command encoded by the jiao causative in (9) and that of request encoded by the rang causative and exemplified by (8). The latter is patently unsuitable for depicting the relationship between master and dog since with the use of rang it may be inferred that there is consideration on the part of the causer for the causee's wishes. At least, this is how the speaker views the relationship in so encoding the sequence of events. (The speech act component is discussed next.)

Neither can the causer be defined as "animate" in the basic rang speech act causative. Animate entities are only acceptable when personification is involved. For non-human animate beings to occur as subject in this rang causative, a complex sentence is preferable with the NP denoting the animate entity forming part of a subject clause rather than standing on its own as the subject. Compare (10) with (11): Sentence (11) is only acceptable if it is a case of personification:

10.            \*Xiao    gou rang    ta de    zhuren wei ta  
              little dog RANG    he GEN    master feed him  
  
              (The little dog had his master feed him.)

11.            Xiao    gou    wang-wang      de jiao,  
              little dog    'bow-wow'    ADV call,  
  
              yisi    shi rang      zhuren    wei ta.  
              meaning be RANG      master feed it

The little dog barked, which meant that it wanted to have its master feed it.

The exclusion of non-human animate NPs from the causer role as in (10) is again due to the speech act component. In (11), the feature of the speech act has to be extended metaphorically to include the case of a dog's barking, being understood as its way of "saying something" and this is made possible by the explanatory initial clause.

The intention to bring about a certain event or state of affairs is attributed to the person denoted by the syntactic subject (the causer) of this rang causative and not the causee. What is the exact relationship viewed by the speaker as holding between these two actants - causer and causee?

The use of this causative is based on the speaker's view of the event fulfilling the semantic requirement that the causee is in the position of being unwilling not to do whatever is asked by the causer, rather than being in the situation where s/he has to do whatever the causer wants, encoded by the jiao speech act causative. Thus, this causative is suitable for expressing requests as the causing event, a typical feature of the more polite social relations existing between host and guests for example.

This feature is apparent when we contrast the acceptable use of rang in (12) with its jiao causative counterpart in (13). The latter is semantically awkward, out of context, due to the expression of a command as part of its speech act structure:

12.        Ta rang kerenmen        duo chi        dianr        cai  
          he RANG guests        more eat        some        dish  
  
          He had the guests eat some more of the dishes.

13.        ?? Ta jiao kerenmen duo chi dianr cai  
          he JIAO    guests more eat    some dish

?? He made the guests eat some more of the dishes.

The use of sentence (13) implies a rude and unfriendly host who treats his guests in a peremptory manner.

That the causee is an agent in this rang construction is clear from the exemplification given. In some of the other rang causatives it will be shown that the person denoted by the pivot nominal is the experiencer of the causative event (q.v. Section 1.2.3). As a consequence of the agentive nature of the causee in this speech act causative, events and states of affairs are excluded from the predicate since non-control emotional states and spontaneous events preclude the causee from being interpreted as an agent. Consider (14) and (15) as opposed to (16).

14.        \* Daoyan rang wo gaoxing (nanguo)  
          director RANG I    happy        (sad)

15.        \* Daoyan rang wo kuqilai  
          director RANG I cry:start

16.        Daoyan rang wo ku.  
          director RANG I cry.

The director had me cry.

The event of kuqilai 'bursting into tears' in (15) and the emotional states of gaoxing 'happiness' and nanguo 'sadness' in (14) cannot be understood to be caused by someone asking another person to enact them, yet in (16) for events such as ku 'cry' which also have the second interpretation of willed action, the rang



causative may be used. In the latter case, it is possible to interpret that an actor can cry 'on demand'.

Similarly, spontaneous mental events such as xiangqi 'call to mind' are proscribed from the speech act causative, whereas those viewed as agentive, such as xiang 'think', may occur in it. Compare (17) with (18):

17.       \* Shuji               rang wo xiang-qilai.  
party secretary RANG I call to mind

18.       Shuji               rang wo zixi       xiang-xiang.  
party secretary RANG I carefully think:TENT  
The party secretary had me give it a careful think.

An additional property of the speech act in this rang causative is that it is not necessarily a direct one, that is, one which takes place face-to-face between causer and causee, unlike the jiao speech act causative:

19.       Tamen xie xin       rang (\*jiao) wo huiqu  
they write letter RANG (\*JIAO) I return  
They wrote a letter to have (\*make) me come back.

Five semantic features of the rang speech act causative of request have been informally described and supported by evidence. To summarize, these constitute the requirements of

- (i) two personal or personified NPs (labelled 'causer' and 'causee' in the syntactic schema)
- (ii) a direct or indirect speech act whereby the causer asks the causee to do something
- (iii) an agentive causee as the consequence of requirement (ii)
- (iv) intention to bring about the causative event being ascribed to the causer

and (v) the non-coercive nature of the relationship between the causer and causee with the causee not being willing not to do what the causer wants.

Informal description is no substitute however for a precise semantic representation which is presented forthwith:

SPEECH ACT CAUSATIVE OF REQUEST WITH RANG

NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>ACTION</sub>
-----------------	------	-----------------	----------------------

Subject	Pivot
Causer	Causee
Person A	Person B

(i) Haizimen rang (\*jiao) mama chi tang.  
 children RANG (\*JIAO) mother eat lollies

The children had their mother eat lollies.

(ii) Daoyan rang ta (\*gaoxing) ku (\*stative  
 director RANG he (\*happy) cry predicates)

The director had him cry (\*be happy).

Assuming that person B doesn't want  
not to do what person A says he wants him  
to do

I say:

Person B did something that person A wanted him  
to do  
because A said he wanted B to do it.

Note that the first component of this semantic representation is in the "assuming" frame, as the speaker would only use this particular causative construction on the assumption that the kind of relationship described for the causer and causee does in fact hold.

(ii) Speech Act Causative of Permission with Rang:

The second causative construction with rang is an intentional causative as was the case for the first one we

examined. Although it has the similar semantic requirements of two persons in the roles of causer and causee, and moreover a causee who is agentive and it involves a speech act, the causative situation depicted is nevertheless quite different to the former. In this construction, intention to bring about the event is attributed not to the causer but to the causee. Due to the nature of the relationship between causer and causee however, the latter requires the former's permission before proceeding to carry out the desired action

	NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>ACTION</sub>
	Subject Causer		Pivot Causee	
20.	<u>Bamende</u>	rang	<u>ta</u>	<u>jinqu.</u>
	doorkeeper	RANG	she	in:go
	The doorkeeper let her go in.			

The use of this causative implies an underlying assumption about the nature of the relationship between causer and causee, one of the causer having the ability to prevent the causee from carrying out the action the latter wants to carry out. This assumption is evident from the consideration of (21) and (22), (21) being unacceptable due to the fact that, out of context, such an assumption is not probable, unless "I" refers to the Governor General or Queen, for example.

21.	<u>*Wo</u>	rang	<u>zongli</u>	<u>zhizheng.</u>
	I	RANG	P.M.	govern
	*I let the Prime Minister govern.			

22.	<u>Zongtong</u>	rang	<u>zongli</u>	<u>zuge.</u>
	president	RANG	P.M.	form:a:cabinet
	The President let the Prime Minister form a cabinet.			

Further evidence supporting the presence of this feature is that when the causee's action is understood to be already in progress, this causative construction may not be used, since the need for permission to start doing the action is thus pre-empted.

23.        \*Jiao lian rang ta pao-xiaqu.  
          coach RANG she run:continue

(The coach let her keep on running.)

In this causative then, the person denoted by the syntactic agent is to be regarded as the causer in the sense of making it possible for an event to be brought about through allowing the causee to begin an action.

Furthermore, this semantic feature entails explicit permission in the form of a speech act: "The causer says that the causee can do this". Of significance for comparison with the third rang causative - a causative of non-interference - is the conception of the causee as being unable to commence the desired action until this permission is granted. In this way, the causer acts as a potential obstacle to the causee's planned course of action. Contrasting to this, in the rang causative of non-interference, the causee's action is already under way and the causer, although viewed as being able to put a halt to the action, refrains from doing so.

Given that a speech act of permission is required, non-human animate entities are not generally acceptable as the causer:

24.        \*Xiao gou rang ta de zhuren wei ta.  
          little dog RANG he GEN master feed him

(?? The little dog let his master feed him.)

However, (25) is acceptable in the case of a watchdog acting as a doorkeeper; as here the dog can be understood to substitute for a human and we have an instance of personification:

25.        Ni keyi shi-shi, neizhi gou rang bu rang ni jinqu.  
          you may try:TENT,    that:CL dog RANG not RANG you enter.

You could try and see whether or not that dog will let you go in.

The restriction to a person filling the role of causee is much stronger for this causative, given the requirement of an agentive causee who wants to bring about a certain event in addition to the speech act of permission.

26.        \*?Xiao Mei rang ta de gou pao.  
          (name)    RANG she GEN dog run

This requirement of an agentive causee, results in the exclusion of stative predicates and predicates denoting spontaneously arising events or processes:

27.        \*Xiao Mei rang muqin gaoxing.  
          (name)    RANG mother    happy

28.        \*Muqin rang xiaohair kuqilai  
          mother    RANG child    burst:into:tears

The features of this causative may be summarized as:

- (i)        two personal NPs
- (ii)       a speech act of permission
- (iii)      the intention to bring about the event attributed to the causee
- (iv)       an agentive causee due to requirement (iii)

- (v) the causer is able to but does not want to prevent the causee from beginning to do what s/he wants
- (vi) causee's action commences only after permission from the causer is granted.

Next the semantic representation for this causative is given:

SPEECH ACT CAUSATIVE OF PERMISSION WITH RANG

- |       | NP <sub>P</sub>                              | RANG               | NP <sub>P</sub>    | VP <sub>ACTION</sub>         |
|-------|--|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
|       | Causer<br>Person A                           |                    | Causee<br>Person B |                              |
| (i)   | <u>Mama</u>                                  | <u>rang</u>        | <u>haizimen</u>    | <u>zai waibianr wanr.</u>    |
|       | mother                                       | RANG               | children           | at outside play.             |
|       | Mother let the children play outside.        |                    |                    |                              |
| (ii)  | <u>*Wo</u>                                   | <u>rang</u>        | <u>zongli</u>      | <u>zhizheng.</u> (*unable to |
|       | I  | RANG               | prime minister     | govern. allow)               |
| (iii) | <u>*Xiao Mei</u>                             | <u>rang</u>        | <u>ta</u>          | <u>nanguo.</u> (*stative     |
|       | (name)                                       | RANG               | he                 | sad predicate)               |
| (iv)  | <u>Ta yao shuo,</u>                          | <u>ni jiu rang</u> | <u>ta</u>          | <u>shuo!</u>                 |
|       | she want speak,                              | you just RANG      | she                | speak                        |
|       | If she wants to speak, you'd better let her! |                    |                    |                              |

Assuming that person B has to do  
what person A says he wants him to do,  
I say:

Person B started to do something that B said  
s/he wanted to do  
because person A said s/he could do it  
not because A wanted him to do it.

The next two rang causative constructions which we will examine are both causatives of non-interference. The person denoted

by the syntactic subject is understood to be able to but does not put an end to an ongoing event of an adversative nature. In this feature, both resemble the rang causative of permission. In the first "non-interference" construction the pivot nominal denotes an agent involved in an ongoing action while in the second it denotes an inanimate entity undergoing a process event.

### 1.2.2 Rang Causatives of Non-Interference

The semantic structure of these two causatives contrasts greatly to those of the two preceding. First of all, even though the first construction requires two personal NPs, there is no speech act understood to take place between them. Rather, the meaning grammaticalized is that the 'causer' does not interfere in the "causee's" ongoing action. Similarly in the second construction, the causer does not interfere in the process event affecting an inanimate entity.

Sentences (29) and (30) exemplify the rang causative of non-interference in an agentive event and the rang causative of non-interference in an agentless event respectively:

	NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>ACTION</sub>
	Subject Causer		Pivot Causee	
29.	<u>Muqin</u>	rang	xiao hair	ku ge gou.
	Mother	RANG	small child	cry:CL:enough
	The mother let the small child cry its heart out.			

	NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>IN</sub>	VP <sub>PROCESS EVENT</sub>
30.	<u>Xiao Mei</u>	yanzhengzheng	rang wo de hua	si-guang -le.
	(name)	wide-eyed	RANG I GEN flower	die-bare:COM.
	Xiao Mei let my flowers die right before her very eyes.			

A pertinent question at this point regards the causative nature of these two constructions: Are they appropriately classified as causative constructions given that the syntactic subject is not the causer of the event in the sense of the first speech act causative?

That intention to cause the event cannot be attributed to the causative subject is evident from the fact that where this interpretation is possible as in (31), we obtain not a causative of non-interference but instead a speech act causative of request: Imagining that the mother and child of (31) are beggars, an appropriate context can be created for its use:

31. Muqin rang xiao hair ku.

The mother had the small child cry (so that they would earn more money).

Sentence (31) is not however open to the interpretation: "The mother let the small child cry". Similarly, sentences (32) and (33) are unacceptable as they are interpreted to mean that the subject did something with the intention of causing the child to burst into tears in (32) or to cause the flowers to die in (33):

32. \*Muqin rang xiao hair ku-qilai.

Mother RANG small child burst:into:tears.

33. \*Xiao Mei rang wo de penhuar si -le.

(name) RANG I GEN potplant die:COM.

Sentence (33) looks very similar to sentence (30): "Xiao Mei let my flowers die right in front of her very own eyes", yet is unable to be given the "non interference" interpretation of sentence (30) but only the intentionally causative one. The use of a



resultative verb si-guang in (30) which means 'die' in the sense that nothing is left of the flowers after the process reaches its completion, allows the correct interpretation to be made that Xiao Mei could have somehow saved my flowers from such complete 'devastation' but failed to do so. In (33), however, with the bare verb si 'die', the interpretation is made of Xiao Mei setting off the process of the potplants dying, that is, of being the cause of the event in its entirety, and so is not acceptable.

Thus, the causal role of the syntactic subject takes on a third subtle permutation of meaning in these two rang causatives: the subject plays a quasi-causal role in "facilitating" an ongoing event to reach its completion, but is not understood as initially causing the event to take place. Nor is there any element of permission involved in this "facilitation". The terms 'causer' and 'causee' for the roles of the two entities involved in the kind of causative event depicted by this construction prove to be misleading rather than apt.

The causal role of the syntactic subject is thus understood in an inverted sense in terms of the event being left to follow its own course to completion by the subject, even though the latter is understood to have the ability to cause its cessation. Therefore, by not putting an end to the process, the subject 'causes' it to go on.

This semantic property provides a further explanation as to why sentence (33) is unacceptable: Even if the process of the flowers dying has already set in (and so Xiao Mei is not understood as doing something to cause them to die), we are still equally unable to interpret that she could somehow cause the flowers not to

die. The same situation holds for its semantically awkward English counterpart, the let causative in (34), when cited out of context. As in Chinese, the oddness of (34) is due to the tendency to interpret it as a let causative of permission:

34.           ? She let the flowers die.

When (34) is compared to (35) however, the ability of the subject to save at least some of the flowers can be clearly interpreted:

35.           She just let all the flowers die.

The following pair of examples of the rang causative is a further illustration of this distinction in Chinese, as (36) is in danger of being interpreted as a rang causative of permission, whereas (37) can be clearly interpreted as a rang causative of non-interference:

36.           \* Chuanzhang rang chuan chen-mo -le.  
              captain       RANG   boat       sink : COM.

(?? The captain let the boat sink.)

37.           Ta jiu zheiyang rang chuan chen-diao-le.  
              he then   this:way   RANG   boat       sink : COM

This was the way he just let the boat sink.

The event denoted by the predicate in these two causatives of non-interference is understood as being already under way at the time when the subject would have been able to intervene, which

accounts for the unacceptability of (36) where the event of sinking is not interpreted as ongoing but as just starting, that is, enabled by the captain. This semantic feature also explains why (38) is acceptable but (39) is not.

38.        Wo rang ta ku-xiaqu.  
          I RANG he cry:continue.  
          I let him keep on crying.

39.        \*Wo rang ta ku-qilai.  
          I RANG he cry:begin  
          (\*I let him burst into tears.)

Therefore, the causatives of non-interference contrast with the causative of permission in that the subject of the causative construction does not pose an obstacle to another person's starting to carry out an action, but rather in refraining to take any action, allows the ongoing action or process to continue.

The claim that the nature of the event allowed to reach its completion is adversative if justified by the following data: Where the second entity involved is a person, the action this person is not hindered from continuing to do, is understood to have adversative implications for this person: This explains why (41) and not (40) is acceptable.

40.        \*Xiao Mei rang ta gaoping-xiaqu.  
          (name) RANG he happy:continue.

41.        Rang ta gaoping qu ba, ta jinzaoyao houhui de.  
          RANG he happily go RP, he early will regret NOM  
          Let him happily go his own way so that he will regret it as early as possible.

Sentence (40) containing the predicate "keep on being happy" is disqualified from being a causative of non-interference on the grounds that no adversative interpretation is available.

Identically for the second "non-interference" construction, where the pivot nominal denotes an inanimate entity, sentence (42) proves to be the unacceptable 'beneficial' counterpart of (30):

42.            \*Xiao Mei rang huayuan de huar kai-xiaqu.  
              (name) RANG garden GEN flower bloom:continue.  
  
              (\*Xiao Mei let the flowers in the garden continue to bloom.)

The meaning of these two causatives can then be informally described as causation of an adversative state of affairs through negligence on the part of the subject in allowing an event to continue taking place or through indifference to its occurrence.

Up to this point, the common features of these two causative constructions of non-interference have been discussed. Due to the fact that in one construction only action and activity verbs occur in the predicate given that the adversative event involves an agent, as opposed to the other construction which encodes non-interference in the process of decay or decline of an inanimate entity, their semantic representations now need separate discussion:

(i)            The Rang Causative of Non-Interference in an Agentive Event

This construction expresses non-interference in another persons's ongoing action, consequently predicates denoting events or states of affairs do not occur in it:

43.            \*Xiao Mei rang ta muqin gaoxing.  
              (name) RANG her mother     happy

This semantic feature also explains the unacceptability of (39) with the predicate ku-qilai 'burst into tears'.

Secondly, this particular causative of non-interference is restricted to semantically (and syntactically) intransitive verbs in its predicate, where the ongoing action of the second person does not extend beyond this agent to affect any other entity:

44.            \*Mama rang Lao Da da Lao Er, bu guan tamen.  
              Mother RANG eldest hit second:eldest, NEG control them.

Sentence (44) is unacceptable in that the event may not be interpreted as one of ongoing action, but rather as the eldest child hitting the second eldest once only. Here the verb is both transitive and punctual.

The features of this rang causative of non-interference we have discussed are first summarized, then explicated in the form of the semantic representation.

#### THE RANG CAUSATIVE OF NON-INTERFERENCE IN AN AGENTIVE EVENT

This construction requires that

- (i) two personal NPs be in subject and pivot positions
- (ii) the pivot nominal denote an agent
- (iii) this agent be already in the process of carrying out an action or activity
- (iv) the syntactic subject be understood as capable of putting an end to the ongoing action but refraining from doing so
- (v) the action be viewed as leading to adversative consequences for its agent.

NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>ACTION</sub>
Subject		Pivot	
"Non-interfering" person		Agent	
Person A		Person B	

(i) Bie guan ta, rang ta ku ge gou!  
 don't care:about him, RANG he cry CL enough  
 Don't take any notice of him, let him cry his heart out!

(ii) \*Rang ta gaoping-xiaqu. (\*stative predicate)  
 RANG he happy:continue.

(iii) Rang ta naoqu, kan ta neng naocheng shenmoyangr.  
 RANG he stir:go, see he can stir:become what:shape.  
 Let him go on causing trouble, and see how far he can go.

Person B was doing something (Z)  
 Person A could've done something  
 because of which person B couldn't have kept on  
 doing Z  
 A didn't do this  
 Person B kept on doing Z because of that  
 I'm thinking of it as bad for person B.

(ii) The Rang Causative of Non-Interference in an Agentless  
 Event

This construction finds its counterpart in one of the  
 English let causatives which also encodes non-interference by the  
 subject in a process or event adversely affecting an inanimate  
 entity.

- 45. Jo let the vegetables rot (\*grow).
- 46. Jo let the milk go sour (\*stay fresh).
- 47. Jo let the flowers wilt (\*bloom).
- 48. Anne let the picture fall down again.

In a similar way to the rang causative of non-interference, if the event is one which the subject does not have the capability of stopping, it cannot be used to form an acceptable let causative of this type. Compare (49) with (48):

49. \*Anne let the rain fall.

Neither may natural phenomena act as the syntactic subject.

50. \*The sun let the flowers wilt (bloom).

The semantic features of this rang causative may then be summarized as the following requirements:

- (i) the subject denotes a person and the pivot nominal an inanimate entity
- (ii) the inanimate entity is the undergoer of a process event already under way
- (iii) the subject is understood to have the ability to put an end to this process but refrains from doing so
- (iv) the process being one of decay or decline leads to an adversative state of affairs for the person thought of as owning it, represented by person P in the formula.<sup>6</sup>

I propose the following semantic representation for this causative:

---

6 The presence of this component in the semantic formula is not specifically justified in this discussion - The reader is however referred to Part I Section 2.2.2. (Adversative Bei Passive of Possessions) for a discussion and explanation of how it can only be the 'owner' or person related to an inanimate NP acting as the subject of a grammatical construction that can be understood to be adversely affected by some event. This remains true whether the construction be passive or causative and in order to avoid repetition, it will not be given a separate discussion here.

NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>IN</sub>	VP	PROCESS EVENT
Subject		Pivot		
"Non-interfering"		Undergoer		
Person A		Thing X		

- (i) Xiao Mei yanzhengzheng rang wo de huar si-guang -le.  
 (name) wide-eyed RANG I GEN flower die:bare:COM.

Xiao Mei let my flowers die right in front of her very own eyes.

- (ii) \*Xiao Mei rang hua kai-xiaqu. (\*non-adversative)  
 (name) RANG flower bloom:continue

- (iii) \*Taiyang rang hua kai-xiaqu. (\*non-human NP as subject)  
 sun RANG flower bloom:continue.

- (iv) Ta jiu zheyang rang chuan chen-diao - le.  
 he then this:way RANG boat sink:away : COM

This was the way he just let the boat sink.

Something was happening to thing X  
 (Thing X can be thought of as belonging to  
 person P)  
 Person A could've done something  
 because of which this wouldn't have kept on  
 happening  
 A didn't do this  
 Thing X came to be in a certain state because  
 of this  
 not because A wanted this to happen  
 I'm thinking of it as bad for person P.

The final pair of causative constructions are both experiencer causatives. They grammaticalize the following meaning: The person denoted by the pivot nominal comes to feel something new either as the result of unintentional causation on the part of another person (denoted by the subject) or else as the result of a prior event in which no person was involved. These two constructions



are labelled experiencer causatives because the person denoted by the pivot nominal in both cases is the experiencer of a new state of feelings or emotions, a more specific case of the consequences of causation than that of being the undergoer of a new state of affairs. Recall that the latter type of causation is encoded by the shi causatives, with which these rang causatives contrast.

1.2.3 The Rang Experiencer Causatives

(i) Experiencer Causative of Unintentional Causation with Rang

One of the main semantic features of this construction is that of unintentional causation, a feature which distinguishes it clearly from the three previous kinds of causation examined - intentional, permissive and non-interference. Secondly, the new state of affairs arising for the undergoer of the event is specifically one which involves feelings or perception.

The syntactic subject is typically a complex NP containing a noun or pronoun denoting a person (not necessarily the head noun) rather than just a single noun. This syntactic feature aids in the interpretation of unintentional causation. This is the reason why (50) as compared with (51) is not semantically well-formed.

	NP <sub>P</sub>		RANG		NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>EXPERIENTIAL</sub>	
						EVENT	
	Subject				Pivot		
	Unintentional	Causer			Experiencer		
50.	<u>?Ta</u>		rang	dajia	gandong	de zhi	liu lei.
	she		RANG	everyone	feel	EXT	just flow tears.

51.        Ta de biao'yan rang da'jia gandong de zhi liu lei.  
she GEN performance RANG everyone feel EXT just flow tears  
Her performance moved everyone to tears.

The unintentional nature of the causation is also clear from the comparison of the following two examples: Sentence (52) may only be interpreted as a speech act causative of request due to the feature of intentional causation. The director wants the actor to cry (in this particular scene of the play), while the event in (53) may only be interpreted as the result of unintentional causation. The actor bursts into tears on being criticised by the director, not because the director wants to make him cry.

Speech Act Causative of Request:

52.        Daoyan rang yanyuan ku.  
director RANG actor cry.  
The director had the actor cry.

Unintentional Experiencer Causative

53.        Daoyan de piping rang yanyuan ku-qilai.  
director GEN criticism RANG actor cry:start.  
The director's criticism made the actor burst into tears.

Evidence for the semantic feature of a new emotional state being caused to arise in the undergoer is found in the unacceptability of (54).

54.        ??Mali rang ta xiang.  
(name) RANG he think

Sentence (54) is more likely to be interpreted as a speech act of request "Mary had him think" (if it can be interpreted at all) due to the action verb xiang 'think' in its predicate.

Even sentences whose predicates encode states of affairs such as (55) and (56) are not acceptable since the latter do not depict newly arisen emotional states.

55.        \*Zhang San rang wo shu-le shikuai qian.  
            (name)        RANG I lose:COM 10:CL money

56.        \*Ta rang Xiao Mei pao-bu-kuai.  
            she RANG (name)        run:NEG:fast

Recall that when expressed in the form of shi causatives [(18) and (4c) respectively in the introduction], these counterpart sentences to (55) and (56) were compatible with states of affairs.

Therefore, not any state of affairs may be encoded by this rang causative but only those that denote a new feeling.

The semantic features of this construction, informally described, are then:

- (i) two personal NPs
- (ii) a new state of feeling or emotions as the consequence of the causative event
- (iii) the interpretation of this new state of affairs as being unintentionally caused by the subject.

The semantic representation is thus formulated as:

EXPERIENCER CAUSATIVE OF UNINTENTIONAL CAUSATION WITH RANG

- |  |                         |      |                 |                             |
|--|-------------------------|------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
|  | NP <sub>P</sub>         | RANG | NP <sub>P</sub> | VP<br>EXPERIENTIAL<br>EVENT |
|  | Unintentional<br>Causer |      | Experiencer     |                             |
|  | Person A                |      | Person B        |                             |
- (i) Zhei haizi rang ren bu fangxin.  
 this child RANG one NEG<sub>1</sub> at:ease  
 This child makes one feel anxious.
- (ii) Mali rang ta ai de fafeng  
 (name) RANG he love EXT go:mad  
 Mary made him feel madly in love.
- (iii) \*Mali rang ta xiang. (\*action predicate)  
 (name) RANG he think
- (iv) Nei jiahuor rang ren wang-er-sheng-wei.  
 that guy RANG one terrified:at:the:sight:of  
 That guy makes you feel terrified at the sight of him.
- Something happened to person B:  
 Person B came to feel something for a certain  
 time  
 (not because he wanted to)  
 because of something that can be said about  
 person A  
 not because A wanted this to happen.

(ii) Experiencer Causative of Agentless Causation with Rang

The second and semantically related experiencer causative has a syntactic subject which denotes an agentless event as the cause of a person's new state of feeling.

- |  |                 |  |      |  |                 |                            |
|--|-----------------|--|------|--|-----------------|----------------------------|
|  | NP <sub>P</sub> |  | RANG |  | NP <sub>P</sub> | VP <sub>EXPERIENTIAL</sub> |
|  |                 |  |      |  |                 | EVENT                      |
|  | Cause           |  |      |  | Experiencer     |                            |
|  |                 |  |      |  | Person B        |                            |
57.      Zhei shir zhen rang ren shengqi.  
           this matter really RANG            one            angry  
           This matter really makes you angry.

Note that the experienced feelings may only be of the kind that are understood to be externally caused (ex definitione). This applies to both kinds of experiencer causatives. Hence, inherent states of being, personality traits and so on are not compatible with this construction. Compare (58) with (59):

58.      \*Zheige xiaoxi rang renjia kuaile.  
           this:CL news RANG people cheerful
59.      Zheige xiaoxi rang renjia xingfen-qilai.  
           this:CL news RANG people excited:start  
           This news had people getting very excited.

This feature is accounted for by the semantic component which states that the experiencer comes to feel something for a certain time (present in the semantic structure of both constructions) and which predicts the incompatibility of such inherent or sustained states as kuaile 'cheerful' with this particular rang causative.

The predicate of this second experiencer causative behaves identically to that of the first in not permitting the co-occurrence of action verbs.

60.      \*Zheige shiqing rang wo zou.  
           this:CL matter RANG I go.

States of affairs other than feelings are also incompatible with this construction, illustrated by the unacceptability of (61) with the predicate pao-bu-kuai 'unable to run fast':

61.           \*Di-shang de xue rang ta pao-bu-kuai.  
ground:on REL snow RANG she run:NEG<sub>1</sub>:fast

The features of the second experiencer causative are then

- (i) a personal NP denoting the single entity involved in the causative event - the pivot nominal
- (ii) a new state of feeling as a consequence of this causative event
- (iii) the understanding of this new state of affairs as being caused by a prior agentless event.

EXPERIENCER CAUSATIVE OF AGENTLESS CAUSATION WITH RANG

- |       | NP <sub>P</sub>              | RANG     | NP <sub>P</sub>         | VP<br>EXPERIENTIAL<br>EVENT        |
|-------|------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
|       | Cause                        |          | Experiencer<br>Person B |                                    |
| (i)   | <u>Zheige wenti</u>          |          | <u>rang wo</u>          | <u>danxin.</u>                     |
|       | this:CL                      | problem  | RANG I                  | worried.                           |
|       | This problem had me worried. |          |                         |                                    |
| (ii)  | <u>*Zheige xiaoxi</u>        |          | <u>rang renjia</u>      | <u>kuai.</u> (*sustained state of  |
|       | this:CL                      | news     | RANG people             | cheerful. affairs)                 |
| (iii) | <u>*Di-shang de xue</u>      |          | <u>rang ta</u>          | <u>pao-bu-kuai.</u> (*non-         |
|       | ground:on                    | REL snow | RANG she                | run:NEG <sub>1</sub> :fast. exper- |
|       |                              |          |                         | iential                            |
|       |                              |          |                         | predicate)                         |
| (iv)  | <u>*Zheige wenti</u>         |          | <u>rang wo</u>          | <u>xiang.</u> (*action predicate)  |
|       | this:CL                      | problem  | RANG I                  | think                              |

(v) \*Zheige shiqing rang wo da ta. (\*action predicate)  
this:CL matter RANG I hit him.

(vi) Zheige xiaoxi rang renjia xingfen-qilai.  
this:CL news RANG people excited:start

This news had everyone getting excited.

Something happened to person B:  
Person B came to feel something for a certain  
time  
because of something else that happened then  
not because anyone wanted this to happen.

### Conclusion

In this section on the rang causative construction, the same basic syntactic form of NP-RANG-NP-VP has been shown to act as the surface form of six distinct semantic structures. The six rang causatives examined were distinguished by the different kinds of entities taking part in the causative events depicted, not to mention the different types of causation involved: intentional, permissive, non-interference, agentless and unintentional, as well as the different consequences of these types of causation: action, event or state of feeling.

In the only construction where intentional causation was involved, the causative event was brought about by means of a speech act of request on the part of the subject (and causer).

A second speech act causative of permission was shown not to be amenable to description as either an intentional, unintentional, agentless or experiencer causative. The subject of this construction was likewise shown not to act as the causer of the event in wanting the 'causee' to carry out an action. Instead, this person is viewed as the causative agent in the sense of enabling

another to do what he or she wants to do by not refusing them the permission. The power to grant or refuse permission is an assumption in the meaning of this construction.

The non-interference causatives form a pair of constructions expressing the subject's lack of intervention in an ongoing event. The subject is presumed to have the ability to put an end to this event, yet refrains from doing so, effectively causing the event to continue on until its completion. Both causatives are unique in expressing an adverse state of affairs resulting from this event for either the undergoer or the person who owns the entity involved in the event.

The experiencer causatives express that a new state of feeling is caused to arise in the person undergoing the event. In one of these two causatives, the cause of the event is ascribed to some aspect of the subject's behaviour, either explicitly mentioned or implicit in the interpretation of this construction. This is the only rang construction which encodes unintentional causation. The second experiencer causative has an agentless event as its cause.

These six types of rang causatives display therefore strikingly different semantic structures, even though their syntactic structure is in the main quite similar. Only the speech act causative of request is able to take semantically and syntactically transitive verbs in its predicate, however.

Cases of ambiguity between the different interpretations afforded by each construction do not present counterevidence to this analysis which has set out to show how the causative use of rang must be separated into these six distinct semantic structures. Consider the command in causative form:



60.        Rang ta zou.  
          RANG she go

It may be interpreted according to the given context as either the speech act causative of request, the speech act causative of permission or the causative of non-interference. In other words, I claim that examples such as (60) are only "ambiguous" out of context. Appropriate contexts for the three different interpretations are created below:

Speech Act Causative of Request

61.        Bie rang ta zai zher dai-zhe, rang ta zou.  
          don't RANG she at here stay:DUR, RANG she go  
  
          Don't let her keep on hanging around here, have her leave.

Speech Act Causative of Permission

62.        Ta xiang zou, jiu rang ta zou ba!  
          she want go, then RANG she go RP  
  
          She wants to go, so just let her go!

RANG Causative of Non-Interference in an Agentive Event

63.        -    "Wo qu ba ta jiao-huilai."  
          I go BA she tell-return  
  
          "I'll go and get her to come back."  
  
          -    "Bu, rang ta zou ba!"  
          no, RANG she go RP  
  
          "No, let her go."

However, these three different interpretations are not due merely to the context in which this rang sentence is used, but

are a consequence of the different semantic structures I have postulated above.

Implicit in the type of semantic analysis carried out here is the claim that none of these six semantic formulae may be conflated with any other but must be kept separate in order to adequately account for all the data examined in the preceding pages. Furthermore, the semantic conditions holding for each construction are interrelated within each semantic formula in different ways so that if any two of these formulae were to be collapsed together, many of the subtle distinctions of meaning that I have claimed to exist and supported with evidence in the preceding discussion would have to be sacrificed as well.

2. JIAO CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

2.1 JIAO AS AN INDEPENDENT VERB

Jiao like rang also functions grammatically as an independent verb and is equally extensive in its uses. One of its basic uses is that of 'name' or 'be called'.

1. Ta jiao shenmo mingr? - Ta jiao Cao Xilei.  
she be:called what name she be:called (name)  
What is her name? - Her name is Cao Xilei.

Related to this use is that of 'call out' or 'greet':

2. Xianzai ni mama jiao ni jinlai.  
now your mother call you in:come  
Your mother is calling you to come in now.

A third use of jiao is its intransitive use that carries the meaning of 'call' in relation to animal or bird cries and even to the noises made by manufactured objects such as whistles:

3. Qidi zai jiao.  
whistle DUR call  
The steam whistle is blowing

4. Tian yi liang, gongji jiao-qilai.  
day once light, rooster call:INC  
As soon as it's daylight, the rooster begins to crow.

The verbal characteristics of jiao are evident from the aspectual modification of the durative zai in (3) and the inchoative qilai in (4).

Of most relevance to the use of jiao in forming its speech act causative construction is its fourth verbal use of 'order':

5. Wo jiao - le yige chuzu qiche.

I order:COM one:CL hire car

I ordered a taxi.

6. jiao cai

order dish (of food)

order a meal

This meaning of jiao would presumably be related to its three preceding uses in the sense of "call for a taxi" or "call (the waiter) to bring one a meal" from which the extension in meaning to that of 'order' has most likely evolved.

Let us now turn to the examination of the jiao causative constructions.

## 2.2 CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FORMED BY JIAO

Given these several related meanings of jiao when used as an independent verb, particularly the meaning of 'order'; it comes as no semantic surprise then, that jiao is used in causative constructions which find close parallels in both the 'coercive' and unintentional make causatives of English.

NP<sub>P</sub>                      JIAO                      NP<sub>P</sub>                      VP<sub>ACTION</sub>

7. Ta                      jiao                      wo                      renzhen kaolü yixia.

he                      JIAO                      I                      seriously consider one:CL

He made me give it serious consideration.

In the following discussion of causatives formed by jiao, three constructions are examined:

- a. The Speech Act Causative of Command with jiao.
- b. Experiencer Causative of Unintentional Causation with jiao.
- c. Experiencer Causative of Agentless Causation with jiao.

Nikitina (1958: 214), as pointed out before, claims that no formal differentiation can be made of the two basic meanings of the causative construction (i) 'make', 'force' or 'order' and (ii) 'give opportunity', 'make possible' or 'permit', 'allow'. This leads to her conclusion that the jiao causative construction can thus express both these meanings while rang usually only expresses that of 'allow' (1958: 212).

The analysis of the rang causatives in the preceding section showed that the meaning grammaticalized by each of the six constructions was more subtle and complex in character than any definition in terms of 'allow' could adequately account for. In fact, informal description in terms of 'allow' would only be applicable to the rang causative of permission and not to any of the other five constructions.

I argue in this analysis of the jiao causatives that none of the three semantic structures proposed can be collapsed with any of the rang causatives. Each is unique. As part of the argumentation it follows that neither does jiao bear the meaning of 'allow' in any of its constructions.

2.2.1 Jiao Speech Act Causative

(i) Speech Act Causative of Command with Jiao

Describing this causative as 'coercive' or as expressing 'force' is at best superficial in its omission of several other equally important features, which are unique to this causative and not encoded by any of the rang causatives.

Although this jiao causative also contains a speech act in its semantic structure, it is not at all identical to the one encoded by rang. Jiao encodes a speech act in the nature of a command, suitably used as the reflection of the relationship between two persons, causer and causee, where the causee has to do what the causer wants, regardless of the former's desires.

This differs from the corresponding rang causative with a speech act of the request kind, where the relationship is rather one where the causee is unwilling not to do what the causer requires. Example (8) below is awkward, as pointed out before, given that our preconception of the typical host of a dinner party as one who looks after every need of his guests is challenged by the reporting of this event in the form of a jiao causative which implies to the contrary that the guests ate more of the food because they were forced to do so by the host. The corresponding rang causative would be the one used for the typical situation of polite social relations between host and guests:

8. ??Ta jiao kerenmen duo chi dianr cai.

he JIAO guests more eat some dish

He made the guests eat some more of the dishes.

As a consequence of this semantic feature, it is a causative construction particularly suited to any kind of unequal

relationship holding between causer and causee - such as that between superiors and inferiors due to any of the parameters of professional rank, social status, age and so on, as viewed by the speaker.

Consequently, the implication for the jiao analogue of the rang causative in (9) is that it could only be used in the situation where the speaker considered the children to be extremely rude and cheeky.

9.           Haizimen rang (??jiao) mama chi tang.  
          children   RANG   (??JIAO) mother eat lolly

The children had (??made) their mother eat some lollies.

Similarly, the essential difference between the rang and jiao causatives exemplified in (10) is that, for jiao, an appropriate context would be one where the causee has been summoned to the party secretary's place for a criticism session. This is not at all an appropriate context for rang due to the different relationship between causer and causee implied by the speech act.

10.           Shuji rang (jiao) wo shang ta nar qu yitang.  
          party sec.   RANG (JIAO) I   up   his place go one:CL

The party secretary had (made) me go to his place.

One consequence of this distinction between rang and jiao causatives concerning the lack of regard for the causee's desires encoded by the latter is that jiao does not form causatives of permission, comparable to the English let causative, as does rang. In let causatives, intention to cause an event is attributed to the erstwhile 'causee' of the speech act causative and not to the causer. (q.v. 1.2.1 (ii)). It will be seen that neither do the two

experiencer causatives formed by jiao encode this element of meaning. Hence, the jiao causative never expresses the meaning of 'allow' as claimed by Nikitina in any of its constructions.

A second consequence of the nature of the speech act encoded by jiao is that non-human animate entities are strictly excluded from the role of causer. As the reader may recall, this was in fact acceptable under certain conditions for the analogous rang causative: where an animal's action such as barking could be understood by metaphorical extension as asking a person to do something for them. Such an interpretation of personification cannot be made in the case of jiao.

11.        Gou zai menwai bu ting de jiao,  
          dog at door:outside continuous ADV call,  
rang (\*jiao) ren gei ta kai men.  
          RANG (\*JIAO) people for it open door

The dog was barking all the time outside the door, to have someone open the door for it.

Where the rang causative with an animate subject is unacceptable, so too is the jiao causative:

12.        \*Gou rang (jiao) ta de zhuren wei ta.  
          dog RANG (JIAO) it GEN master feed it

Conversely, the causee may designate a non-human animate entity as this is suited to the kind of 'superior-inferior' relationship assumed in the use of the jiao causative. In this set of circumstances, the rang causative is not at all appropriate:

13.        Pao-le yizhen, ta you jiao (\*rang) shengkou man-xialai.  
          run:COM one:CL, he again JIAO (\*RANG) livestock slow:down  
          After a gallop, he made the draughthorses slow down again.



14. Zhang san jiao (??rang) ta de xiao gou guolai.  
(name) JIAO (??RANG) he GEN little dog over:come  
Zhang San made his little dog come over to him.

In addition, the speech act is understood to take place face-to-face between the causer and causee, a third way in which the rang and jiao causatives differ. The semantic constraint of a direct speech act explains why jiao is unacceptable in (15).

15. Tamen xie xin rang (\*jiao) wo huiqu  
they write letter RANG (\*JIAO) I return  
They wrote a letter to have me come back.

In (16), the use of jiao implies only a face-to-face instruction whereas rang may also be used in the situation of the subject leaving a note for the causee:

16. Ta rang (jiao) wo liudian zhong guolai.  
she RANG (JIAO) I six o'clock over:come  
She had (made) me go over at six o'clock.

A feature which jiao shares with the two rang speech act causatives is that the person denoted by the pivot nominal be agentive. Thus neither spontaneously arising events nor states of affairs over which a person has no control may occur in the jiao speech act causative of command, exemplified by unacceptability of the predicate xiang-qilai 'bring to mind' in (17) and gaoxing 'happy' in (18) respectively:

17. \*Laoshi jiao Xiao Mei xiang-qilai.  
teacher JIAO (name) bring:to:mind
18. \*Li Si jiao ta gaoxing.  
(name) JIAO she happy

Again, events such as ku 'cry' and xiao 'laugh' which have a controlled action reading can be used in this jiao construction.

19.     Daoyan jiao ta ku (xiao).  
          director JIAO he cry (laugh)  
  
          The director made him cry (laugh).

To take up the point once more that there are no jiao analogues of the rang speech act causative of permission nor of the two rang causatives of non-interference, let us examine each causative type separately.

The rang causative of permission can apparently be converted into a jiao construction, it is true, but not one that means 'let someone do what they want'. The jiao counterpart may only be interpreted in terms of the speech act causative of command. Serving as proof of this are examples (19) and (20) below, where the (a) sentences are rang causatives of permission and the (b) sentences are jiao causatives of command.

19.   a.   Bamende rang ta jinqu.  
          doorkeeper RANG he enter  
  
          The doorkeeper let him go in.
- b.   Bamende jiao ta jinqu.  
          doorkeeper JIAO he enter  
  
          The doorkeeper made him go in.
20.   a.   Ta yao shuo, ni jiu rang ta shuo.  
          she want speak, you then RANG she speak  
  
          If she wants to speak, you'd better let her speak.

- b. ?Ta yao shuo, ni jiu jiao ta shuo.  
she want speak, you then JIAO she speak

?If she wants to speak, you'd better make her speak.

The non-occurrence of a jiao causative construction with the meaning of 'allow' devolves upon the fact that in the relevant rang construction, the desire to do something is conferred upon the causee. Jiao causatives have no such semantic feature.

Secondly the more striking evidence is presented by the two rang causatives of non-interference with either a person or an inanimate entity denoted by the pivot nominal. These may not be converted into any of the jiao causatives at all.

RANG Causative of Non-Interference in an Agentive Event

21. Muqin rang (\*jiao) xiao hair ku ge gou.  
mother RANG (\*JIAO) little child cry CL enough

The mother let (\*made) the small child cry its heart out.

RANG Causative of Non-Interference in an Agentless Event

22. Ta jiu zheyang rang (\*jiao) chuan chen-diao-le.  
he then this:way RANG (\*JIAO) boat sink:away:COM

This is the way he just let (\*made) the boat sink.

Thus contrary to the statement made by Nikitina, jiao does not express the meaning of 'allow' or 'let' through the causative construction of command it forms. The remaining jiao experiencer causatives in being either unintentional or agentless in nature preclude this meaning as well, as will be demonstrated below.

The features of the jiao speech act causative of command that have been postulated are then:

- (i) a personal NP denoting the causer and an animate NP, the causee

- (ii) a face-to-face speech act which is based upon the assumption that the causee has to do what the causer wants
- (iii) consequent upon (ii), an agentive causee
- (iv) intention to bring about the event is ascribed to the causer.

The meaning grammaticalized by this causative is formulated in the following way:

SPEECH ACT CAUSATIVE OF COMMAND WITH JIAO

- |       | NP <sub>P</sub>   | JIAO     |                                     | NP <sub>AN</sub>     | VP <sub>ACTION</sub> |
|-------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|       | Causer<br>(Person A)  |          |                                     | Causee<br>(Person B) |                      |
| (i)   | <u>Xiao Mei</u>   | jiao     | tamen ziger taolun,                 |                      |                      |
|       | (name)  | JIAO     | they self discuss,                  |                      |                      |
|       | <u>ta xian</u>  | tuichu   | yihuir.                             |                      |                      |
|       | she first   | withdrew | one:CL                              |                      |                      |
|       | Xiao Mei made them discuss it on their own, and withdrew for a while. |          |                                     |                      |                      |
| (ii)  | <u>*Xiao Mei</u>  | jiao     | tamen gaoxing (*Stative predicate)  |                      |                      |
|       | (name)  | JIAO     | they happy                          |                      |                      |
| (iii) | <u>*Tamen xie xin</u>   | jiao     | wo huiqu (*Indirect speech act)     |                      |                      |
|       | they write letter   | JIAO     | I return                            |                      |                      |
| (iv)  | <u>*Xiao gou</u>  | jiao     | ta de zhuren wei ta. (*Non-human    |                      |                      |
|       | little dog  | JIAO     | it GEN master feed it animate NP as |                      | subject)             |
| (v)   | <u>Xiao Duizhang</u>  | jiao     | dahuo jiancha qiang-li de zidan.    |                      |                      |
|       | (name) Captain  | JIAO     | everyone inspect gun:in REL bullet  |                      |                      |
|       | Captain Xiao made everyone inspect the ammunition in their guns.      |          |                                     |                      |                      |

Assuming person B has to do what person A says  
 he wants B to do,  
 I say:

Person B did something person A wanted him to do  
 because A said to B that he wanted B to do it

Next the two experiencer causatives formed by jiao are examined.

### 2.2.2 Jiao Experiencer Causatives

#### (i) Experiencer Causative of Unintentional Causation with Jiao

This causative construction requires two personal NPs as does its rang counterpart, the subject denoting the unintentional causer of the event and the pivot nominal the experiencer of a new state of affairs, specifically a feeling or perception. The unintentional nature of the causation is evident from comparing (23) with (24), both of which form acceptable experiencer causatives of this kind.

23. Ta jiao wo xiang yige lao pengyou.  
she JIAO I think:of one:CL old friend  
She made me think of an old friend.

24. Ta de yangzi jiao wo xiangqi yige  
she GEN appearance JIAO I recall one:CL  
congqian de tongxue.  
former REL classmate  
Her appearance made me recall a former classmate.

The complex NP acting as the subject of (24) ta de yangzi 'her appearance' allows the clear interpretation of unintentional causation, since it precludes any action on the part of the subject as causing the event. As the meaning of (24) is very similar to that of (23), it lends support to regarding 'she' as likewise being the unintentional causer of the event depicted in (23). Note that only experiential predicates - either mental or emotional events and

states of affairs - are permissible in this construction. If the predicate denotes an action or any other kind of non-experiential state of affairs then the jiao causative cannot be used. Compare (25) with (26), the latter being unacceptable due to the presence of the action verb likai 'leave':

25.        Ta de biao yan        jiao da jia        gandong de  
          he GEN performance JIAO everyone feel        EXT  
  
          zhi liu lei.  
          just flow tears  
  
          His performance moved everyone to tears.

26.        \*Ta de biao yan        jiao da jia        likai.  
          he GEN performance JIAO everyone leave

Similarly, states of affairs other than those of emotional and mental experience are proscribed, exemplified by pang-qilai 'get fat' in (27):

27.        \*Ta jiao haizi pang-qilai-le.  
          he JIAO child fat-INC:COM

This causative construction is also widely used in exclamations of the form:

- |     |                                      |             |             |            |               |                    |
|-----|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|---------------|--------------------|
|     | NP <sub>P</sub>                      | ZHEN        | JIAO        | REN        | VP            | EXPERIENTIAL EVENT |
| 28. | <u>Ta</u>                            | <u>zhen</u> | <u>jiao</u> | <u>ren</u> | <u>xihuan</u> | <u>(tao yan).</u>  |
|     | he                                   | really      | JIAO        | one        | like          | (dislike)          |
|     | He really pleases (disgusts) people! |             |             |            |               |                    |

In this type of exclamation, the intensifier zhen 'really' is used in conjunction with the noun ren used in its generic sense and variously translated as 'you', 'one' or 'people'.



33.           Ta zhen jiao ren xihuan!  
              he really JIAO one like

He really makes people like him!

This observation devolves upon a crucial semantic distinction between the rang and jiao experiencer causatives. Informants remark that the two experiencer causatives formed by jiao are much stronger and intense in expressive force than their rang counterparts. This intuition seems to mirror the comparison between the jiao and rang speech act causatives as well, one of the semantic contrasts for these two constructions being a speech act of command versus a speech act of request as we have seen. What precisely then is the distinction between the jiao and rang experiencer causatives? Given that further research is needed to analyse this distinction fully, I would like to provisionally explicate it as the jiao causative encoding the unexpected or surprise nature of the event as viewed from the speaker's perspective, a feature absent in the corresponding rang causative. In (34), the use of jiao as opposed to rang implies the speaker's view that the actor had only intended to make the audience sad with his performance but ended up by causing them to cry, to his surprise. This element of meaning is not encoded by the use of rang in (35):

34.           Ta de biao yan jiao guan zhong ku-qilai.  
              he GEN performance JIAO audience cry:INC

His performance unexpectedly made the audience start crying.

35.           Ta de biao yan rang guan zhong ku-qilai.  
              he GEN performance RANG audience cry:INC

His performance had the audience crying.



The use of jiao in exclamations with the intensifier zhen 'really' and secondly the presence of the identical feature of the unexpected nature of the event in the jiao passive as opposed to the rang passive for which I am able to provide a well-documented argument (q.v. Chapter 6 below) serve as two further pieces of evidence in favour of postulating this feature in the semantic structure of the experiencer causatives formed by jiao.

The summary of semantic features and the semantic representation for the unintentional experiencer causative with jiao therefore both incorporate this provisional semantic component of "unexpectedness" as I believe that some attempt should be made to formalize the intuitions of informants which have been so consistently expressed.

EXPERIENCER CAUSATIVE OF UNINTENTIONAL CAUSATION WITH JIAO

Summary of features:

- (i) two personal NPs, the subject denoting the unintentional causer and the pivot nominal, the experiencer
- (ii) the experiencer undergoes a new state of feeling or perception
- (iii) this state of affairs is the result of unintentional causation on the part of the subject
- (iv) the intensity of this new state of feelings is viewed as unexpected by the speaker

NP <sub>P</sub>	JIAO	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>EXP</sub>
Unintentional Causer (Person A)		Experiencer (Person B)	

- (i) Ta jiao Xiao Mei xiao-qilai.  
He JIAO (name) laugh:INC  
He made Xiao Mei start laughing

(ii) \*Laoshi jiao wo xiang-qilai. (\*No predicate of emotion)  
teacher JIAO I think-INC.

(iii) ??Ta jiao ren xihuan. (\*No intensifier)  
he JIAO one like

(iv) Ta zhen jiao ren xihuan.  
he really JIAO one like  
He really pleases people!

Person B came to feel something for a certain  
time.  
(not because B wanted to)  
because of something that can be said about  
person A (Y)  
not because A wanted this to happen  
? I think nobody would've thought B could feel  
like this because of Y

Recall that I am only provisionally postulating the last  
component of the semantic representation to account for the  
unexpected or surprise nature of the event as viewed by the speaker  
- a feature of meaning lacking in the corresponding rang causative.  
The provisional nature of this component is indicated by a question  
mark preceding it.

(ii) Experiencer Causative of Agentless Causation with Jiao

The second experiencer causative has a semantic structure  
closely related to the former, the main difference being that there  
is no person involved in the causing event, but only in the caused  
state of affairs, making it a "one entity" causative. The subject  
of this causative may thus designate the causing event by means of a  
simple or complex NP, clausal subjects being also permitted.

NP (VP) JIAO NP<sub>P</sub> VP<sub>EXP</sub>

CAUSE: Experiencer  
(An agentless event) (Person B)

36. Zheige shiqing jiao wo fan-si le.  
 this:CL matter JIAO I annoyed:INT INC.

This matter made me extremely annoyed.

37. Songlai de dongxi jiao ta shifen manyi  
 send:come REL thing JIAO she very satisfied

The things which were sent over made her feel very satisfied.

The fact that there is a different kind of causing event encoded by this construction combined with the feature of only one entity being involved rather than two means that this causative cannot be conflated with the first jiao experiencer causative since the components of meaning are consequently interrelated in a different way.

States of being which are not externally caused or if they are, are long-lasting in nature, such as those considered to be personality traits, cannot occur in this causative nor in the first unintentional experiencer causative. Contrast the acceptability of the predicate xingfen-qilai 'get excited' with kuaile 'cheerful' in (38):

38. Zheige xiaoxi jiao renjia xingfen-qilai (\*kuaile) le.  
 this:CL news JIAO everyone excited:INC (\*cheerful) INC.

This news made everyone get excited (\*cheerful).

This constraint also applies to the make causative analogue in English of these experiencer causatives:

39. The news made George excited (\*joyous) (\*clever).

Action verbs such as xiang 'think' may occur as part of the predicate when they combine with other constituents to give the overall meaning of a new state of feeling, as required by this causative, but not when they retain their action reading:

40. Ye bu lai feng xin, dou jiao ren  
 also NEG<sub>1</sub> come CL letter, all JIAO one  
xiang-si (\*xiang) le.  
 think:INT (\*think) INC

When not even a letter comes, it makes you worried to death with thinking. (NOT: \*it makes you think.)

The semantic formula of this second experiencer causative takes this form:

(ii) EXPERIENCER CAUSATIVE OF AGENTLESS CAUSATION WITH JIAO

NP (VP)	JIAO	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>EXP</sub>
CAUSE			
Agentless Event		Experiencer (Person B)	

- (i) Zhei chang shengli jiao tamen deyi-ji le.  
 this:CL victory JIAO they proud:INT INC  
 This victory made them extremely proud.

- (ii) \*Zheige xiaoxi jiao Li Si zou. (\*action predicate)  
 this:CL news JIAO (name) go

- (iii) Zheige xiaoxi jiao Li Si jingqi de hen.  
 this:CL news JIAO (name) surprised EXT very  
 This news made Li Si very surprised.

- (iv) \*Di-shang de xue jiao ta pao-bu-kuai. (\*non-experien-  
 tial predicate)  
 ground:on REL snow JIAO he run:NEG<sub>1</sub>:fast

(v) Zheifen liwu guanbao jiao ta manyi.  
this:CL present surely JIAO she satisfied

This present will surely make her pleased (contrary to expectations).

Person B came to feel something for a certain  
time  
because of something else that happened then  
(event Y)  
not because anyone wanted it to happen.  
? I think nobody would've thought B could feel  
like this because of Y

Again, note that a question mark is placed before the final component of the semantic representation to indicate its provisional nature as the component of 'unexpectedness'.

#### Conclusion

In this section, three causative constructions formed by jiao have been analysed, comprising one intentional causative containing a speech act of command and two experiencer causatives.

It has been demonstrated that none of these causatives express the notion of allowing or letting someone do what they want, since the desire of the causee to do something (or of an experiencer to feel something) is not encoded as a feature of meaning by any of these jiao causatives, contrary to Nikitina's claim to that effect.

Contrasting to this, in the rang causative of permission, the intention to carry out an action is predicated of the causee and not the causer. Such a feature is unique to this particular rang causative, not being found present in any other of the five rang causatives examined nor in any of the three jiao causatives.

Secondly, evidence was given to serve as proof of there being no jiao causatives with a semantic structure akin to the rang causatives of non-interference.

The notion of force entailed by the use of jiao that has also been commented upon by Nikitina (1958: 212) was investigated and described as well, resulting in a semantic representation which made possible a more subtle explication in terms of a speech act requiring that the causee has to do what the causer says he or she wants done.

This speech act and the relation between the causer and the causee which can be inferred from it, was next compared to the speech act encoded by the analogous rang causative. Here, the exact elements combining to give the overall impression of the coercive nature of the jiao causative were again able to be effectively compared with those of the more polite rang speech act causative due to the systematic application of terms of natural language in the semantic analysis. Moreover, only the jiao speech act causative was shown to entail the notion of force or coercion.

Finally the semantic structures of the jiao experiencer causatives were proposed with an alleged component of "unexpectedness" differentiating them from the corresponding rang experiencer causatives. It was pointed out that more research to verify this feature is needed. Nevertheless, this tentatively proposed component of meaning is intended to account for speakers' intuitions that the two jiao experiencer causatives are 'stronger' and 'more intense' in expressiveness than the corresponding rang causatives.

The proposed formulae account also for the impression that the rang causatives are "more polite" than the corresponding jiao causatives. As is often the case, the greater "politeness" of a form is the function of subtle differences in the semantic structure.

3 SYNTACTIC DIFFERENTIATION OF PASSIVE FROM CAUSATIVE  
CONSTRUCTIONS FORMED BY RANG AND JIAO

Although passive and causative constructions in Chinese are identical in their basic syntactic form of NP- RANG (JIAO)-NP-VP, they may nevertheless be differentiated according to their syntactic behaviour which reflects the underlying distinctness of their semantic structures.

It is true that examples of rang and jiao constructions can be found which when cited in isolation are ambiguous between passive and causative readings:

1. Ta rang (jiao) wo shuo - le.  
he RANG (JIAO) I speak:COM
  - a. He had (made) me explain.
  - b. He was criticised by me.

In fact, this example may even have the third interpretation of a rang causative of permission: "He let me speak".

Nikitina believes that the passive use of rang and jiao is historically derived from their causative use (1958: 219). She states further that although the passive constructions are sometimes difficult to distinguish formally from the causative constructions, for example, when there is no third NP present as in (1), they can always be differentiated according to their meaning:

The passive construction differs from the causative in that the subject of the passive ... is the undergoer of the action and the passive object ... is the actor. (1958: 218)

Having already commenced the task of distinguishing the passive and causative constructions by semantic methods in the preceding sections, through the explication of their semantic structures, I will now show how they can be formally differentiated before proceeding to the semantic analysis of the rang and jiao passives.

First of all, can the passive be differentiated from the causative in terms of the number of NPs allowed as Nikitina has implied? The passive typically exhibits a two-argument structure, the two entities involved being the undergoer and the agent. The same description may be applied to the causative constructions which also have two basic arguments representing, for example, the causer and causee.

However, there is no strict correspondence between the number of noun phrases and the type of construction. In Chapter 3 of Part I, it was shown that the bei passive of bodily effect makes use of three NPs designating the undergoer, the agent and the part of the body which is directly affected by the passive event. So too may speech act causative constructions when the main verb is semantically transitive, yet only two NPs if it is intransitive. This kind of superficial syntactic analysis does not lead, I believe, to any substantial or useful results, however.

Contrasting to this, the grammatical categories of aspect, negation and modal verbs reveal differences in syntactic behaviour which are attributable to the distinct semantic structures of passives and causatives. Each category is examined below in turn.



3.1 ASPECTUAL MARKING AND SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS

3.1.1 Verbal Aspect Constructions with Completive -le,  
Experiential -guo and Durative -zhe.

In the introduction to Part II, while arguing against the classification of Chinese causative constructions as serial verb constructions, I pointed out that the independent verbs jiao and rang lost their verbal characteristics on becoming used as causative verbs. In causative constructions, neither jiao nor rang can be aspectually modified. Thus the completive aspect marker -le modifying the causative verbs rang and jiao in (2) produces an unacceptable sentence:

2.       \*Shuji           rang (jiao)-le wo chuli zhejian shi.  
          party sec. RANG (JIAO):COM I handle this:CL matter

If the speaker wants to express that the party secretary's causative act of requesting has taken place already, then (3) can be used instead:

3.       Shuji       shuo rang wo chuli zhejian shi.  
          party:sec. say RANG I handle this:CL matter

The party secretary said to have me deal with this matter.

Similarly, the experiential aspect marker -guo may not be used to modify a causative verb, as demonstrated by (4). If the speaker wishes to stress that the causative act has taken place at least once in the past, then the adverb cengjing 'at some time in the past' may be used as in (5):

4.       \*Shuji rang (jiao)-guo wo chuli zhejian shi.  
party:sec. RANG (JIAO):EXP I handle this:CL matter

5.       Shuji cengjing rang wo chuli zhejian shi.  
party:sec at:some:time RANG I handle this:CL matter  
          in:the:past

The party secretary has already had me deal with this matter in the past.

Neither can the durative aspect marker -zhe modify the causative verb. Compare (6) with (7) where adverbial means are used to render the overall meaning that the causative act of the subject is under way at the moment of speaking.

6.       \*Shuji rang (jiao) -zhe wo chuli zhejian shi.  
party:sec RANG (JIAO) :DUR I handle this:CL matter.

7.       Shuji zhengzai rang wo chuli zhejian shi.  
party:sec in:the:course:of RANG I handle this:CL matter

The party secretary is in the process of asking me to deal with this matter.

However (7) does not have a causative meaning, as the translation shows, since the use of zhengzai 'in the process of' in indicating that the causative subject's action is not yet completed means that neither can the causee's action be understood to be completed. "I" have only been asked to do something, but have not yet done it.

None of the syntactic exponents bei, rang or jiao of the three passive constructions may be aspectually modified either. Compare (8) with (9). When the passive markers bei, rang and jiao are aspectually modified as in (8), ungrammatical sentences are produced. Only (9) is acceptable where it is rather the main verb in the predicate which is so modified:

8. \*Moshuping  $\left. \begin{array}{c} \text{bei} \\ \text{jiao} \\ \text{rang} \end{array} \right\} - \left. \begin{array}{c} \text{le} \\ \text{guo} \\ \text{zhe} \end{array} \right\} \text{ didi da-fan.}$   
ink:bottle PASSIVE ASPECT brother knock:over

9. Moshuiping  $\left. \begin{array}{c} \text{bei} \\ \text{jiao} \\ \text{rang} \end{array} \right\} \text{ didi da-fan le.}$   
ink:bottle PASSIVE brother knock:over:COM

The ink bottle was knocked over by my younger brother.

If the passive and causative constructions were to be considered serial verb constructions then the first verb in the series (bei, rang or jiao) should be able to take aspectual modification which extends over all the VPs in the sentence, whether or not explicitly marked. Clearly this is not the case. At best, we may only conjecture that used as either passive exponents or causative verbs, rang, jiao and bei are moving towards auxiliary or prepositional status [q.v. Nikitina (1958); Li and Thompson (1973); Lord (1973)] and are no longer verbal in these uses. This is particularly clear in the case of bei which has no independent usage as a verb.

Secondly, neither the syntactic subject of the passive nor of the causative acts as the subject or agent of the second verb in the main predicate. In (10), the subject of the causative verb shuji 'party secretary' does not refer to both the person who issues the request as well as the one who carries it out:

10. Shuji rang wo chuli - le zhejian shi.  
party:sec RANG I handle:COM this:CL matter.  
The party secretary had me deal with this matter.

Neither is the subject of the passive in (11) understood to be the person who carries out the criticism, but rather the undergoer of the event:

11.     Ta rang wo piping - le yixia.  
          he RANG I criticise:COM   one:CL  
  
          He was given criticism by me.

Both these features of uniform aspectual marking and same subject are requirements of serial verb constructions as defined in Lord (1973) and Schachter (1974). [q.v. Section 0.1.]

In contrast to the causative verb itself, the verb in the main predicate of the rang and jiao causative constructions does take aspectual modification, but only modification which is appropriate for the causative meaning grammaticalized. Thus only the completive aspect marker -le and the experiential aspect marker guo co-occur with causative constructions. Modification by the completive aspect marker is exemplified by (10) above and the experiential aspect marker by (12) which follows:

12.     Shuji rang wo chuli-guo (\*-zhe) zhejian shi.  
          party:sec RANG I handle:EXP (\*DUR) this:CL matter

The party secretary had me deal with this matter in the past.

The case for the compatibility of the durative aspect marker -zhe with causative constructions is identical to that for passives. Neither of the two durative constructions [outlined in Part I, 1.3.2] expressing ongoing action or a sustained state of affairs caused by the subject's action is compatible with the semantics of a causative construction.

It has already been demonstrated that the bei passive is restricted to encoding a completed event (q.v. Part I 1.3) Likewise causative constructions need to encode that the causative event is completed (ex definitione) or else they cannot be considered to be causative in nature.

Ongoing action in not being part of the meaning grammaticalized by causative constructions is thus immediately excluded when syntactically indicated by the durative aspect marker -zhe, as (12) reveals. So too is a sustained state of affairs, since even though it has been caused by an action, the action is not that of an external agent as required by all the rang and jiao causative constructions but that of the subject of the new state of affairs himself (or herself).

Recall examples of the second durative construction of a sustained state of affairs such as (84) [from Part I, 1.3.2], altered slightly and presented as (13) below:

13.     Ta shu-zhe shuang bian, chuan-zhe  
          she comb-DUR   two       plaits, wear:DUR  
  
          baise changpao ...  
          white    long:gown

She was wearing her hair in two plaits, and had on a long white chongsam ...

With only one entity involved and thus the interpretation of external causation pre-empted, neither is this particular durative construction able to be combined into any of the causative constructions.

### 3.1.2 No Aspectual Marking

If there is no aspectual marking on the verb of the main predicate, without a supplied context or unless there is modification by time adverbials as in (5), the sentence does not have any causative interpretation as exemplified by (14) below:

14. Shuji rang (jiao) wo chuli zhejian shi.  
party sec. RANG (JIAO) I handle this:CL matter

In (14), the appropriate interpretation is that of a request or command: the party secretary has asked or told me (or is asking or telling me) to deal with the matter, but I still haven't done so.

### 3.1.3 Inchoative Sentential le

The use of the inchoative aspect marker le to modify a rang or jiao sentence has identical consequences to the absence of any aspectual marking. - Causation is not encoded. In (15), the combination of rang and the inchoative aspect marker le encodes again a request whereas jiao and le encodes a command:

15. Shuji rang (jiao) wo chuli zhejian shi le.  
party:sec RANG (JIAO) I handle this:CL matter INC

Now the party secretary has asked (told) me to deal with this matter.

Although the inchoative sentential marker le expresses that a new state of affairs has arisen - "It's the situation now (as opposed to before) that I've been asked to do this" - again, there is no implication that the request (or order) has been carried out, and thus a causative interpretation is not possible.

3.1.4 Perfect Constructions -le ... le and -guo .. le

A third construction comprising both verbal -le and sentential le which plays a similar role to the use of the present perfect tense in English has been discussed during the analysis of the bei passive [Part I, 1.3.1]. This construction proves to be semantically compatible with causative constructions through its encoding of the effect on the present of a past event<sup>7</sup>

16. Shuji rang wo chuli - le zhejian shi le.  
party:sec RANG I handle:COM this:CL matter INC

The party secretary has had me deal with this matter.

Thus to be interpreted as a causative construction, apart from the possibility of the context or adverbial modification encoding this, the major syntactic method is the use of the verbal aspect marker -le to indicate the completion of the causative event. Secondly, the experiential aspect marker -guo may also be used to modify the main verb in this way, or thirdly the perfect construction formed by -le ... le.

Note that a second kind of perfect construction formed by the experiential aspect marker -guo in conjunction with inchoative sentential marker le may be used as well in causative constructions:

17. Shuji rang (jiao) wo chuli-guo zhejian shi le.  
party sec. RANG (JIAO) I handle:EXP this:CL matter INC

The party secretary has had (made) me deal with this matter in the past.

---

7 The perfect aspect construction is so named as it is usually translated by the English present perfect tense. Completive verbal -le is often translated by the English preterite.

With respect to the semantics of verbal aspectual marking then, the causative constructions behave identically to the passive constructions formed by bei, jiao and rang. The semantic requirement of encoding a completed event found in both types of syntactic constructions is thus typically realized through the use of the verbal aspect marker -le and to a lesser extent by the verbal aspect marker -guo.

On the other hand, passive and causative constructions behave differently with respect to the perfect constructions formed by -le ... le or -guo .. le, the passive not occurring with either [discussed in Part I, 1.3.1]. Consider the passive in (18) modified only by -guo as opposed to that of (19) which co-occurs with guo ... le. Only (18) is acceptable:

18. Ta rang feitu qiang-guo.

he RANG bandit rob:EXP

He has been robbed by bandits in the past.

19. ?\* Ta rang feitu qiang-guo le.

he RANG bandit rob:EXP INC.<sup>8</sup>

Thus, apart from their different semantic structures, passive and causative constructions may be distinguished by their behaviour with respect to aspectual marking.

---

8 The passive with the perfect construction -guo ... le proved to be semantically anomalous with or without context. Informants could only understand (19) as "He's already been robbed (several times) in the past by bandits (so now it's your turn)". Similarly with the passive ?\*Ta bei wo da-guo le "He's already been beaten up by me", the implication was also one of "now it's your turn" or "you didn't need to beat him up as I've already done it".



The syntactic behaviour of negative markers presents an even clearer case in reflecting the different semantic structures of the passive and causative.

### 3.2 NEGATION

In the analysis of the passive [Part I, 1.3.4), it was shown that the passive may only be negated by the negative marker mei (you) and not by bu. This point is exemplified by (20) and (21) respectively:

20. Wo mei you bei shuji piping.  
I NEG<sub>2</sub> BEI party:sec criticise  
I was not criticised by the party secretary.

21. \*Wo bu bei shuji piping.  
I NEG<sub>1</sub> BEI party:sec criticise

Furthermore, it was shown that the negative marker must always precede the passive exponent bei (or rang or jiao), never occurring in the predicate before the main verb.

22. \*Wo bei shuji bu (mei you) piping  
I BEI party sec. NEG<sub>1</sub> (NEG<sub>2</sub>) criticise

Causative constructions, however, may be negated by using both the syntactic positions of

- (i) placement of the negative marker before the causative verb
- (ii) placement of the negative marker before the main verb.

From this it follows that the causative and passive constructions can also be differentiated syntactically by the possibility of negative markers occurring in the predicate of the causative but not in that of the passive.

What is of more interest is the semantic repercussions of the two syntactic methods of negation used by causative constructions. The semantic effect of causative verb negation differs strikingly to that of main verb negation. Moreover, negated causative constructions prove to be semantically asymmetrical to affirmative causative constructions and not the mere converse.

### 3.2.1 Causative Verb Negation

NP <sub>P</sub>	BU	JIAO	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP
	MEI (YOU)	RANG		
Causer	NEG		Causee	

First of all, let us consider negation by bu.

23. Ta bu rang wo piping Xiao Mei.  
 he NEG<sub>1</sub> RANG I criticize (name)

The negated causative in (23) has the semantic effect of the English translation "He wouldn't (didn't) let me criticise Xiao Mei". The causative verb rang negated by bu cannot mean "He didn't have me criticise Xiao Mei" or "He didn't ask me to criticise Xiao Mei". Neither can the negated jiao causative mean "He didn't make (tell) me to criticise Xiao Mei".

When bu is used to negate the causative verb of a causative construction with rang or jiao, the overall interpretation is one of not letting or not allowing another person to do what they want, the additional implication being that it is the pivot nominal, "I" in (23), who wants to carry out the action, here, a political criticism session.

This leads us to assert that negation by bu does not form the contradicted counterpart of the two intentional causatives with rang and jiao (the speech act causative). It may be viewed as the negated counterpart of the rang causative of permission, however:

24.     Ta rang wo zou.  
          he RANG I go.  
  
          He let me go.

25.     Ta bu rang wo zou.  
          he NEG<sub>1</sub> RANG I go.  
  
          He wouldn't let me go.

It is most productive however to view the causative verb negated by bu as forming a construction in its own right, separate and unique in its semantics from affirmative causative constructions. The fact that bu cannot be used to negate the passive construction, as exemplified by (21), is due to the subject being non-agentive [q.v. Part I.1.3.4] as opposed to agentive in intentional causative constructions.

Secondly, the use of mei (you) to negate the causative verb gives rise to an interpretation distinct from that of (23):

26.     Ta mei rang (jiao) wo piping     Xiao Mei.  
          he NEG<sub>2</sub> RANG (JIAO) I criticise (name)

Sentence (26) is interpreted as "He hasn't asked me to criticize Xiao Mei" or "He hasn't told me to criticize Xiao Mei" in the case of the jiao causative. The appropriate context for (26) would be one where the speaker contradicts a previous assumption that the desire to conduct a criticism session emanates from the causative subject, "he". This context is created by (27):

27. Ta mei (\*bu) rang wo piping Xiao Mei,  
he NEG<sub>2</sub> (\*NEG<sub>1</sub>) RANG I criticize (name)

shi wo ziji jue ding qu piping de.

be I self decide go criticize NOM.

He didn't ask me to criticize Xiao Mei, it was me who decided to go and do it.<sup>9</sup>

Hence, this form of negation is appropriately used as the contradiction of the speech act causatives with jiao and rang. Consider two further examples, cited in context, that clarify the use of bu and mei (you) in negating the causative verb.

28. - Ta de zhuozi, ni zenmo bu zhengli?  
she GEN desk, you how NEG<sub>1</sub> tidy

- Why is it you're not tidying up her desk?

- Ta bu jiao wo zuo.  
she NEG<sup>1</sup> JIAO I do.

She wouldn't let me do it.

29. - Liudian ban le, zenmo hai mei zuo fan?  
six o'clock half INC, how still NEG<sub>2</sub> make food

It's already 6.30, how come you still haven't made dinner?

- Ta mei jiao wo zuo.  
she NEG<sub>2</sub> JIAO I do

She hasn't told me to do it.

Therefore, only the use of mei (you) as the mode of negation may be properly considered the contradiction of the speech

---

9 This kind of negation in Chinese does not allow the possible implication as does the English that "someone else asked me to do it".

act causatives. The use of bu does not serve to contradict an assumption that the causative event took place but rather expresses that the causer would not let the causee do what the latter desired and thus may only be used to contradict the rang speech act causative of permission.

### 3.2.2 Main Verb Negation

Unlike the passive construction, the main verb in the predicate of the causative may also be negated by bu or by the negative imperative markers bie or bu yao [q.v. Part I.1.3.5] but not by mei (you). Consider (30), (31) and (32) in turn, exemplifying these points respectively:

30. Ta rang (jiao) wo bu zuo.  
he RANG (JIAO) I NEG<sub>1</sub> do  
He asked (told) me not to do it.
31. Ta rang (jiao) wo bu yao zuo.  
he RANG (JIAO) I NEG IMP do  
He asked (told) me not to do it.
32. \*Ta rang (jiao) wo mei zuo.  
he RANG (JIAO) I NEG<sub>2</sub> do

The exclusion of mei (you) from negating the main verb in (32) is due to its meaning of contradicting an assumption that the event has already taken place which contrasts to the meaning of bu of negating the assumption of an agent wanting to carry out an action. Only the latter kind of negation is appropriate in the predicate of an intentional causative construction. Sentence (32) has the same problems of interpretation as does the English "He asked (told) me not to have done it".

To the contrary, the meaning of (30) and (31) is based on an assumption that the causee wants to carry out a certain action which the causer doesn't want the causee to do (anymore) and explicitly says so.

Li and Thompson (1981: 610) claim that in the case of pivotal constructions formed by the verbs they classify as Group 1, "for the ones that have meanings closely related to giving commands or making suggestions, the clauses that follow are actually imperatives". As a consequence, they make the second claim that "if the clause is negative, then the imperative negatives bie and bu yao must be used". (Note that jiao 'tell' is included in this group, although elsewhere (1981: 602) it is classified as belonging to another subtype of the serial verb construction.) This claim is supported by the following data (their numbering and translation):

73. a. ta quan women bie zou.  
3sg advise we don't go  
S/He advised us not to leave.
- b. \*ta quan women bu zou.  
3sg advise we not leave

This is not a generalization that can be made for all the verbs in their Group I, however, which includes quan 'advise', pai 'send', qiu 'beg', weitu 'entrust', qing 'invite' and jiao 'tell'. The data I have presented such as (30) and further data from Nikitina (1958) show that in the case of jiao and rang, the negative marker bu may negate the main verb. On this point, I agree with Nikitina (1958: 220) who states that "In constructions with jiao and rang, the negative is most frequently placed before jiao and rang,

but can also be placed before the main verb". She illustrates this with the following example (my numbering) from the writings of Zhou Libo:

33. Tou liang tian ta you shuo-chu le sange dijiao,  
first two day he again explain:out CON three:CL cellar

xiang yao jiao ren bu kou ta de qiang.  
think want JIAO people NEG<sub>1</sub> dig he GEN gun.

During the first two days, he revealed another three hiding places (cellars), thinking to make them not try and dig out his guns.

Therefore, the intentional causatives where negation occurs within the predicate encode a speech act where the causative subject explicitly asks (or tells) the causee not to do something. They are understood to be causative in the sense of one person causing another not to do something the latter had intended to do.

The experiencer causatives formed by rang and jiao also freely co-occur with predicates negated by bu but not by mei (you).<sup>10</sup> The semantic effect differs from that of the intentional causatives as the overall meaning remains one of causing the experiencer to come into a new state of feeling.

34. Ta rang (jiao) wo bu (\*mei) fangxin.  
she RANG (JIAO) I NEG<sub>1</sub> (\*NEG<sub>2</sub>) at:ease

She had me feeling ill at ease.  
(She made me feel ill at ease.)

Thus, negation of the predicate verb by bu does not amount to a contradiction of the causative event having taken place for

---

10 The non-occurrence of mei (you) as a negative marker in the experiencer causatives belongs to the more general restriction that stative verbs may only be negated by bu.

either intentional or unintentional causatives formed by rang and jiao. This function is fulfilled instead by the use of mei (you) when it negates the causative verb and secondly by the use of bu in this position which gives the overall meaning of 'not let'.

The fact that the subject of intentional causative constructions is agentive explains why both negative markers may be used to negate the causative verb, and not merely mei (you) alone as in the case of passive constructions where the subject is semantically the undergoer. The reason why the passive subject cannot co-occur with bu is that the latter acts as a negative in the sense of "not wanting to do something" (q.v. Part I.1.3.4) and thus implies and requires an agentive subject.

Negation of the predicate verb entails a speech act of the form "Don't do this" on the part of the causer. Only bu and negative imperatives formed by bu such as bu ya'o and bie may be used in this syntactic position.<sup>11</sup>

To summarize, the causative construction is used with three modes of negation, applied to either the causative verb or to the main verb, whereas the passive is used only in conjunction with one mode of negation mei (you), syntactically positioned before the passive exponent bei, jiao or rang. Main verb negation is excluded from the passive due to the semantic requirement of a completed event being encoded, syntactically realized by an affirmative predicate.

---

11 Bie is phonetically a contraction of bu yao 'don't', favoured over the latter in northern Mandarin.



3.3 MODAL VERBS

In both passive and causative constructions, modal verbs are excluded from modifying the main verb in the predicate.

35. \*Ta rang (jiao) wo neng (keyi) piping.  
he RANG (JIAO) I can (may) criticize

This can be simply explained in terms of the semantic requirement that the passive or causative event be understood as completive. "Being able to do something" encoded by modal verbs such as neng is not compatible with the meaning grammaticalized by both passive and causative constructions of "having done that something".

36. \*Ta bei wo neng (keyi) da.  
he BEI I can (may) hit

However, in causative constructions, unlike passive constructions, modal verbs of ability may precede and thus modify the causative verb.

37. Ta neng (keyi) jiao wo zuo.  
he can (may) JIAO I do  
He can (may) make me to do it.

Compare (37) with the unacceptable passive in (38):

38. \*Ta neng (keyi) bei jingcha zhua-dao.  
he can (may) BEI police arrest

A different situation is found for modal verbs which indicate future probability or possibility of an event. These may both precede the causative verb and passive exponent but not the main verb in the predicate, as pointed out initially:

(i) Causatives

a. Preceding Main Verb:

39. \*Ta jiao wo xiang (hui) (yao) zuo.  
he JIAO I think:of (will) (want) do

b. Preceding causative verb

40. Ta xiang (hui) (yao) jiao wo zuo.  
he think:of (will) (want) JIAO I do.

He's thinking of making me do it.  
(He will make me do it.)  
(He wants to make me do it.)

In the case of the passive construction, only hui is compatible with its meaning however [explained in 1.1.3.4]:

(ii) Passives

a. Preceding Main Verb

41. \*Ta bei jingcha hui zhua-dao.  
he BEI police will arrest

b. Preceding Passive Marker

42. Ta hui bei jingcha zhua-dao.  
he be:likely BEI police arrest

It's probable that he's been arrested by the police.

Modal verbs placed before the causative verb modify the causative subject's agentive role and thus neither modify nor contradict assumptions about the causee's action or the causative event. This is why they are acceptable in the causative constructions, but on the whole not in passive constructions apart from hui when it carries the meaning of 'be likely to'.

In conclusion, the syntactic behaviour of three grammatical categories - aspectual marking, negative markers and modal verbs - has been shown to be different in each case for the passive as opposed to the causative construction. This was claimed not only to serve as three means of syntactic differentiation but also to be explicable in terms of their distinct semantic structures.

4. INTRODUCTION TO THE COLLOQUIAL PASSIVES IN CHINESE FORMED  
BY RANG AND JIAO

As in the case of rang and jiao causatives, little specific research has been undertaken on the passives formed by rang and jiao. This is not surprising since they are generally considered to be merely the colloquial variants of the bei passive and thus to have the same meaning. [cf. Ding Shengshu (1979: 100); Guo Derun (1981: 30); Liang Donghan (1960: 75); Lü (1941: 62); Lü 1980 (268, 405); Wang Huan (1957: 33); Wang Liaoyi (1957: 112) and Zhang Zhigong (1957: 93)]. Once again, this treatment can be attributed to the fact that the three passive constructions have identical syntax: NP-BEI(RANG)(JIAO)-NP-VP.

Apart from their colloquial nature, there are two further points upon which there is a general consensus, these also being upheld in my analysis. The first is that the colloquial passives exceptionlessly express adversity as part of their grammaticalized meaning. This feature is attributed to the confinement of rang and jiao to the colloquial register. The following statement by Wang Li concerns this first point (1957: 15-16):

Their [rang, jiao and gei] extent of application is as of old, which is to say, they express that something unfortunate has happened to the thing represented by the subject .... Therefore, the influence of foreign languages is limited, it has only influenced literary language to some extent, but in ordinary language, the historical element is most crucial.<sup>12</sup>

---

12 This viewpoint is also propounded by A.A. Dragunov in his annotations of Wang Liaoyi's Hanyu Yufa Gangyao (Outline of Chinese Grammar) (1957: 111, Footnote 10), and by Guo Derun (1981: 31).

The verb gei 'give' is used as a passive exponent in non-standard Chinese (that is, not in putonghua) e.g.  
(contd.)

Secondly, the even more commonly made observation is that the agent of the passive event must be obligatorily expressed [cf. Hong Xinheng (1956: 28); Li and Thompson (1981: 507); Liang Donghan (1960: 75); Tang T'ing-chi (1972: 159) and Wang Huan (1957: 33)]. For example, Liang Donghan (1960: 75) states:

Bei and gei may both be linked up with the verb to give the verb a passive quality. Jiao and rang, however, can only be placed in front of the agent (without exception) and may not be linked up with the verb.

Liang exemplifies this point with the unacceptability of (1) which has the syntactic form of RANG-VP

1.        \*rang chui-xi                    -le  
           RANG blow:extinguish:COM

as opposed to (2) with the form RANG-NP-VP:

2.        rang fengxue                    chui-xi                    -    le  
           RANG snowstorm        blow:extinguish        : COM  
           to get blown out by the snowstorm

These two features shared by the rang and jiao passives of being unconditionally agentful and adversative and thirdly their

---

12        (contd.)

Ta gei didi da le "He was beaten up by his younger brother". As it represents a dialectal phenomenon, it has not been analysed [c.f. Wang Huan's statement "Gei does not replace bei in the Beijing dialect" (1957: 31) - and recall that the Beijing dialect of northern Mandarin constitutes the basis of standard Chinese - putonghua.]

Since the argument in favour of considering bei as an adversity passive (presented in Part I, Ch.1.1) applies to the two colloquial passives as well, I will not restate the case here.

colloquial use, partially account for the fact that neither has a Europeanized counterpart. The fact that the agent is obligatorily expressed leads to immediate exclusion from the agentless type of Europeanized passive in Chinese exemplified by the bei construction in (3):

3.        Hu Yaobang bei xuanwei fu-zongli.  
          (name)      BEI elect:as vice-premier  
  
          Hu Yaobang was elected as vice-premier.

4.        \*Hu Yaobang rang (jiao) xuanwei fu-zongli.  
          (name)      RANG (JIAO) elect:as vice-premier

Secondly, the adversity feature leads to exclusion from the construction type represented by the Europeanized bei passive with a collective agent:

5.        Ta bei (\*rang) (\*jiao) danwei jiangli-le.  
          she BEI (\*RANG) (\*JIAO) unit      award :COM  
  
          She was given an award by her work unit.

A possible linguistic motivation behind the rang and jiao passives retaining their 'traditional' meaning and not developing a Europeanized form as did the bei passive, is their use elsewhere as both causative verbs and independent lexical verbs. Bei does not have any other grammatical uses apart from that of passive exponent, nor can it be used as an independently occurring verb, so that the problem of ambiguity does not arise.

In previous sections, we have seen that apart from the two rang causatives of non-interference which are adversative in nature, the causative constructions are all neutral in their overall meaning

with respect to the effect of the causative event on the causee or experiencer.

Since the rang and jiao passives are restricted to an adversative interpretation, this aids in the maintenance of distinct semantic structures for rang and jiao passive and causative constructions. Moreover, the adversative rang causatives of non-interference can never be interpreted as passives since only semantically and syntactically intransitive verbs occur in the predicate. The only potential for ambiguity with the passive lies with the intentional speech act causatives. This arises when the latter contain semantically transitive verbs in their predicate but the direct object denoting the undergoer of the action has been ellipsed:

6. Ta rang wo piping -le yixia.

he RANG I criticize:COM one:CL

Causative: (i) He had me criticise (somebody).

Passive: (ii) He was criticised by me.

Secondly, ambiguity between passive and intentional causative readings arises with the passive of bodily effect which due to the presence of its 'retained object' possesses a three-argument structure resembling a causative construction where the overt direct object of the transitive verb occurs:

7. Ta rang renjia kun-zhu -le shou he jiao.

he RANG people tie:fast:COM hand and foot

(i) He had them tie up his hands and feet.

(ii) He had his hands and feet tied up by them.

These two sources of potential ambiguity between a passive (ii) and an intentional causative reading (i) are resolved upon

being returned to their given context. They are merely a product of citation in isolation.

Nevertheless, neutralization or loss of the adversity feature in the rang and jiao passives would have created greater potential for ambiguity with their causative constructions. Therefore, it was only possible for the bei passive to produce an offshoot construction under the influence of translations from European languages as there was no other syntactic construction formed by bei with which to confuse the neutral Europeanized bei passive such as a causative construction.

In the previous section, the syntactic behaviour of passive and causative constructions was discussed and compared, and likewise, in earlier sections, the semantic structures of the bei passive and the rang and jiao causatives were treated.

In this final section, in order to complete the analysis, the semantic structures of the colloquial rang and jiao passives are explicated and compared with the bei passive.

In explaining these two passive constructions as colloquial versions of bei, one is in fact explaining very little. By defining the semantic conditions under which each is used, however, delicate and subtle distinctions in the overall meaning can be found. Moreover, these semantic features remain constant and thus constitute the essence of the meaning grammaticalized by each construction.

First of all, let us examine the rang passive:



5. THE COLLOQUIAL RANG PASSIVES

5.1 THE RANG PASSIVES OF "AVOIDABLE EVENTS"

Despite the lack of research on the colloquial passives, one isolated comment on the semantic nature of the rang passive stands out from the others discussed above:

Bei expresses the phenomenon of suffering. Sometimes, jiao, rang (and gei) can also express this, as their use is almost the same as that for bei, but there is a slight difference of meaning, e.g.

Bie rang feng chui le.  
[Don't get blown on by the wind.]

Here we can think of a way to stop the wind from blowing on us. Bei doesn't have this meaning.  
Yuyansuo (1953: 28)

Although this viewpoint states the case for the semantic structure of the rang passive in a very rudimentary form and it is not clear whether the jiao passive (or gei passive) is meant to be included by this remark, it does make a revealing semantic contrast between rang and bei. However, there is no formalization of this remark nor attempt to ascertain whether or not it is a consistent feature of any of the passive constructions examined in the rest of the article.

Given that the investigation of the semantic properties of the rang passive and formalization thereof is the aim of the present analysis, how then, does the semantic structure of the rang passive differ from that of the bei passive.?

It is not purely arbitrary that rang is used in both passive and causative constructions. Interrelationships of meaning are to be found between the various rang constructions, resulting

from certain components of meaning being present in two or more constructions. One component of meaning that occurs in both the rang causativeness of non-interference and the rang passive is the component which states in the former type of construction that the subject could prevent an ongoing event from continuing to happen but does not do so [q.v. Part II. 1.2.2]. In this section, I argue in favour of a similar, though not identical feature being considered a semantic component of the rang passive to the effect that the undergoer could have done something to prevent the event from happening in its entirety but does not take any action at all with this purpose in mind.

Secondly, I argue that a semantic parallel can be made between the juxtaposition of the be passive and the get passive in English on the one hand and the bei and rang passives in Chinese on the other. The proviso needs to be added here that the be passive in English does not express adversity as does the bei passive in Chinese. This viewpoint stands in contradistinction to that adopted by Chu (1974: 468):

[I]n many ways the get passive is closer in meaning to the Chinese [bei] passive than the be passive is. Both for example, indicate the speaker's attitude to some extent and the unfortunate nature of the occurrence.

Contrary to Chu, I claim that the non-reflexive adversative get passive has many more components of meaning in common with the rang passive than it does with the bei passive. The get passive also parallels the rang passive in its exclusion from the more formal registers of speech such as news broadcasting (q.v. Part I.4).

Consequently, if the occupation of parts of Kampuchea by Vietnamese forces is regarded by the speaker as unprovoked by

Kampuchea then the English speaker would not use the get passive and neither would the Chinese speaker use the rang passive:

8. Jianbuzhai de da pian lingtu bei Yuenan qinzhan-le.  
Kampuchea REL large part territory BEI Vietnam occupy:COM  
A large part of Kampuchean territory was occupied by Vietnam.

9. ??Jianbuzhai de da pian lingtu rang Yuenan  
Kampuchea REL large part territory RANG Vietnam  
qinzhan-le.  
occupy:COM  
??A large part of Kampuchean territory got occupied by Vietnam.

The use of rang or get in this context implies that the Kampuchean government did not actively resist the invasion of its own territory. In other words, the government could have foreseen the possibility of an invasion and thus tried to prevent it but did not do so.

Recent re-evaluation of political events in China also gives a clear indication of how speakers would use rang as opposed to bei in deference to the official party line: Bei may be appropriately used to describe the vilification of Liu Shaoqi which occurred during the Cultural Revolution (1966-76) but is now considered to be a grave political error:

10. Liu Shaoqi bei (\*rang) renjia kou-shang le  
(name) BEI (\*RANG) people put:on COM  
pantu de maozi.  
traitor REL cap.

Liu Shaoqi was labelled a traitor by everyone.

In contrast to this, for Zhang Chunqiao, a member of the so-called Gang of Four who was arrested in 1976, put on trial in 1980 and convicted of having committed many crimes during the Cultural Revolution, these events would not generally be expressed in terms of the bei passive, unless it is his sympathizers or supporters who do so:

11.     Zhang Chunqiao rang (?bei) renjia kou-shang-le  
          (name)           RANG (?BEI) everyone put:on:COM  
fandang de maozi.  
          antiparty REL cap  
  
          Zhang Chunqiao got (was) labelled an antiparty element.<sup>13</sup>

A person who is considered to be the innocent and helpless victim of circumstance (in the eyes of the speaker) cannot be encoded as the subject of the rang passive. Thus, the case of an event involving a person who is considered to be a national hero would be encoded by means of the bei passive, for example, the death of one of China's child heroes Wang Xiao'er during the Anti-Japanese War (1937-1945):

12.     Wang Xiao'er bei (\*rang) guizi da-si           -    le.  
          (name)           BEI (\*rang) devil strike:die   :   COM  
  
          Wang Xiao'er was (\*got) killed by the Japanese.

An additional reason why the rang passive in (12) is totally unacceptable is the further implication of the passive event being avoidable on the part of the subject. As a consequence, the

---

13 The English be passive used to translate (11) with auxiliary was in parentheses, is left unmarked by any question mark symbol or asterisk since there is no general consensus of opinion in the English-speaking world about the culpability or innocence of Zhang Chunqiao as there is in China.

inference can be made that the subject was somehow to blame as well through not preventing or trying to avoid the event. Thus, the use of the rang passive and the inference it makes possible is tantamount to expressing that the subject deserved what happened to him (or her). It may be recalled that the adversative get passive also allows such an inference to be made (q.v. Part I.4).

This is not to say that all adversative passive events affecting social undesirables such as hoodlums, louts and the like will always be encoded by a rang passive to allow the speaker or addressee to make the inference of the subject getting their just desserts. It may be that the speaker can only conceive of, for example, a gang member, as always fully resisting any form of physical aggression, so that in the event of such a person being defeated in a fight, the bei passive may be appropriately used. If a gang member was ambushed by another gang and being outnumbered was beaten up, (13) could be appropriately used:

13. Neige liumang bei tamen zou - le yidun.  
that:CL hooligan BEI they beat : COM one:CL.  
That hooligan was beaten up by them.

However, it would be equally natural to use a rang passive here, in a context where it was clear that the hooligan had not been sufficiently vigilant or cautious for if he had been, he would have prevented the incident from taking place:

14. Neige liumang rang tamen zou - le yidun.  
that:CL hooligan RANG they beat :COM one:CL  
That hooligan got beaten up by them.

As a consequence of this semantic feature of the rang passive, the event is viewed as less serious in nature than when encoded by bei.

Nonetheless, it may not be concluded that because both rang and bei passive constructions may be used to report an identical event, their meaning is the same. The two constructions remain mutually exclusive in their interpretations due to their distinct semantic structures: The same 'real world' event is viewed in two entirely different manners by the speaker when described by means of the rang passive as opposed to the bei passive.

The semantic property of the speaker viewing the undergoer as being able to avoid the event accounts for the less serious tone of the rang passive which is remarked upon by native speakers. The bei passive, on the other hand, is highly suited to expressing events regarded as serious in nature by the speaker.

The most convincing argument for the semantic feature of "avoidability" is found in the case of events of destruction which are particularly inappropriate when occurring in the rang passive with a person as the subject, yet not in the corresponding bei passive:

15. Nainai rang tamen huo-zang-le.  
grandmother RANG they cremate:COM

The rang sentence in (15) is not likely to be interpreted as a passive construction meaning "Grandmother got cremated by them" since the use of the rang passive implies not only that the subject was cremated alive but also that she did not put up any resistance

to it.<sup>14</sup> - Sentence (15) is more likely to be interpreted as a rang speech act causative, suited to the following context:

16.     Qunian     women   jia   yige     lao   yongren   si   le.  
last:year our   home one:CL old servant die INC  
  
   Nainai         rang   tamen   huo-zang-le.  
grandmother RANG they   cremate:COM

Last year an old servant in our household died. Grandmother had them cremate (him).

Sentence (16) is understood as a causative with the direct object of huo-zang 'cremate' ellipsed. As Nikitina (1958: 217) remarks with respect to causative constructions: "If the predicate is a transitive verb, its object can be omitted when it is obvious from the context".

Yet, the bei passive can be used for an event resulting in death, since in it, the subject-undergoer is viewed as a pure victim of circumstance, helpless to avoid the fate that befalls her: Sentence (17) with the bei passive would be appropriately used to express events that happen, for example, in the time of war:

17.     Nainai         bei   tamen   sha-si     le.  
grandmother BEI they stab:die COM.

Grandmother was killed by them.

Therefore, ability to prevent a misfortune is the component of meaning responsible for the inappropriateness of events leading to death in the rang passive. It is exceedingly difficult to conceive of the person denoted by the syntactic subject as taking no action

---

14 The use of a rang passive to express this kind of event is thus completely distasteful as far as native speakers are concerned, and should, they say, be avoided.

to prevent their own death, as if they would willingly allow themselves to be killed.

This finding with respect to the rang passive applies equally clearly to the get passive in English for which (18) and (19) are also semantically inappropriate:

18. ?? My grandmother got cremated by them.

19. ?? John got killed in a car accident.

The following semantic representation for the rang passive with a person as the subject and undergoer is proposed:

(i) THE RANG PASSIVE OF AVOIDABILITY WITH A PERSON AS THE UNDERGOER

NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>COM</sub>
Undergoer		Agent	
Person A		Person B	

(i) Tang Shan hao ji wan ren BEI (\*RANG) dizhen  
 (place name) good many 10,000 person BEI (\*RANG) earthquake  
duo-qu - le shengming. (\*predicate denoting death)  
 take:away:COM life

Many hundreds of thousands of people were (\*got) killed in the Tang Shan earthquake.

(ii) \*Zhang San rang Mali zhen-xi-le. (\*not adversative)  
 (name) RANG (name) cherish:COM

\*Zhang San got cherished by Mary.

(iii) Zhang San rang Mali fang-qi-le.  
 (name) RANG (name) abandon:COM

Zhang San got dropped (for somebody else) by Mary



- (iv) Ta rang Mali (\*chui-peng) piping -le. (\*not adversative)  
he RANG (name) (\*flatter) criticize COM

He got criticized (\*flattered) by Mary.

Something happened to person A  
because person B did something to A  
A could've done something  
because of which this wouldn't have happened  
A didn't do this  
I'm thinking of it as something bad that happened  
to A.

- (ii) THE RANG PASSIVE OF AVOIDABILITY ON THE PART OF AN  
ADVERSELY AFFECTED OWNER

In both the rang passive and the get passive, inanimate nouns may be found in the position of syntactic subject. However, this construction is subject to severe restrictions in English as opposed to Chinese.

For the beneficial get passive, inanimate subjects are excluded in English unless the 'owner' of these is explicitly expressed by means of a possessive pronoun or phrase.

20. \*Three telephone boxes got repaired outside that post office.

The get passive in (20) is unacceptable for semantic reasons, as the 'owner', that is, the person who wanted to and would benefit from the repair of the telephone boxes is not overtly expressed. When the person who stands in such a relation to an inanimate entity is explicitly given in the beneficial get passive, an acceptable sentence is obtained. Compare (21) with (22) and (23):

21. \* A bike got fixed yesterday.

22. ??The bike got fixed yesterday.

23. My bike got fixed yesterday.

In (21) and (22), it is not at all apparent who wanted the bike to be repaired and thus no interpretation is possible as to who would benefit from the event. (The justification for this component of meaning being an invariant of the beneficial get passive is given in Part I Chapter 4.)

On the other hand, the adversative get passive with an inanimate subject behaves similarly to the rang passive in that as long as an 'owner' is interpretable from the context, an acceptable sentence is formed. The 'owner' need not be explicit. Sentence (43) from Part II Chapter IV is repeated below as (24) for the reader's convenience:

24. Three telephone boxes got smashed up outside that post office.

The argument has already been presented in the chapter on the get passive to support the interpretation of the person deemed responsible for the upkeep of public telephones as being the one viewed as adversely affected by the event (v.p.201).

When the 'owner' or person considered responsible for the inanimate subject of the adversative get passive is overtly expressed, examples cited in isolation become even more semantically well-formed. Compare (25) with (26) and (27):

25. ? A window got smashed.
26. The window got smashed.
27. All the windows in our house got smashed.

In sentence (27), it is clear that the persons affected by the smashing of the windows include the speaker and the other occupants of the house. Even though in (25) and (26) there is no

overt expression of the affected person, with adversative events, provided that the entity denoted by the syntactic subject is "definite" (v. Part I 1.2 for definition thereof); as it is in (26), the sentence will be acceptable.

In Chinese, although the rang passive with inanimate subjects contains the identical component linking the inanimate entity to a person, there is no strict syntactic requirement for the latter to be overtly expressed. Examples of rang passives without the 'owner' expressed prove to be interpretable out of context in the same way as the adversative get passives with an inanimate subject but no overtly expressed 'owner', exemplified above by (24) and (26). Consider the rang passive in (28):

28.     Moshuiping rang didi da-fan-le.  
          ink:bottle   RANG   brother knock:topple:COM

The ink bottle got knocked over by my younger brother.

Indeed a rang construction is more likely to be interpreted as a passive when the subject is inanimate. There is no possibility of confusing passive with causative interpretations in these cases since an inanimate entity is not normally viewed as a potential agent and causer, contrasting to the situation where both the main NPs of a rang or jiao construction denote persons and thus the subject may be either agentive or passive in its role.

Wang Huan (1957: 33) also points out that it is simpler to distinguish passive from causative constructions when the subject is inanimate, since then it cannot be interpreted as "making someone do something".

Thus, the unacceptable or at best substandard get passive of (29) does have a counterpart in the Chinese rang passive, given in (30).

29. ?? The bodies got buried by the rescue team.

30. Shiti rang jiuहुodui mai-le.  
body RANG rescue:team bury:COM

The reason why (30) is acceptable in Chinese is that the use of rang has the implication that the event was a misfortune for the persons linked by the context (which is not supplied here) to the subject entity: for example, the relatives of the dead who wished to hold a memorial service to pay their last respects or the police doctors who wanted to perform an autopsy but failed to postpone a burial that was earlier than usual. (Given the same context, for the get passive in (29), it may become acceptable upon an adversative reading rather than a beneficial one.)

Therefore, in the rang passive with an inanimate entity as the subject, verbs of destruction may be used since the person adversely affected is not the actual undergoer of the event, but rather someone who is linked explicitly or through the context to the inanimate entity acting as subject. Thus, the event depicted by example (31) would be a misfortune for those who wished to hold a proper burial:

31. Shiti rang ren huo-zang -le.  
body RANG people cremate :COM

The body was cremated by them.

The semantic representation for the rang passive of possessions which has an inanimate entity as its subject is formulated in the following way.

(NP <sub>P</sub> )	NP <sub>IN</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>COM</sub>
(Person A)	Thing X		Person B	
("Owner")	"Possession"		Agent	

<u>Xiangpian</u>	<u>rang</u>	<u>xiao meimei</u>	<u>si-le.</u>
photo	RANG	little sister	tear:COM

The photos got torn up by my little sister.

Thinking of thing X as belonging to person A  
I say:

Something happened to thing X (event Y)  
because person B did something to X  
Person A could've done something  
because of which Y wouldn't have happened.  
Person A didn't do this  
I'm thinking of Y as something bad that happened  
to person A.

## 5.2 RANG VERSUS BEI: A SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIATION

The rang passive is more restricted in usage than the bei passive in that it does not co-occur with events involving emotional states or processes, even where these may have an active interpretation open to them (q.v. Part I.1.4). Rang constructions with such predicates tend to be interpreted as either causatives of non-interference or as experiencer causatives, the particular interpretation depending upon whether or not the causee has an agentive role. Let us consider (32) with the predicate ai-shang 'fall in love' which is a rang causative of non-interference:

32. Xiao Mei rang Zhang San ai-shang - le.  
(name) RANG (name) fall:in:love : COM  
Xiao Mei let Zhang San fall in love with her.

In (32), the causative subject is viewed as not preventing Zhang San from falling in love with her. As (32) does not have a

passive interpretation, there is no implication of adversity, but rather one of Mary not caring about what has happened.

If the experiential predicate is open to the interpretation of intentional causation on the part of the subject when it occurs in a rang construction, then it does not form an acceptable rang causative. Compare (32) with (33):

33.     \*Xiao Mei rang Zhang San ai de budeliao.  
          (name)   RANG   (name)   love:EXT: extremely  
  
          (?Xiao Mei had Zhang San being in love with her to the  
          point of desperation.)

The rang passive excludes events involving the emotions since they cannot be thought of as avoidable or able to be prevented on the part of the subject-undergoer - the person who would be adversely affected by another's love or hate - but only by the experiencer himself.

In Part I, Chapter 1.4, the bei passive however, was shown to be compatible with experiential predicates, provided that an agentive interpretation was possible. Compare the bei passive of (34) with the rang causative of (35). Both contain identical predicates, yet the rang construction does not have a passive interpretation, despite the potentially active reading of hen-si 'hate intensely'.

34.     Ta bei Mali hen-si -le.  
          he BEI (name) hate:INT:COM  
  
          He was hated so intensely by Mary.
35.     Ta rang Mali hen-si-le.  
          he RANG (name) hate:INT COM  
  
          He let Mary hate (him) intensely.

Moreover, the unacceptable rang construction in (33) has an acceptable counterpart in the bei passive of (38), formed by the same predicate.

36. Xiao Mei bei Zhang San ai de budeliao.  
(name) BEI (name) love:EXT:extremely

Xiao Mei was loved by Zhang San to the point of desperation.

In (36), the role of the syntactic subject, Xiao Mei, is completely passive. Zhang San's falling in love with her is not understood to be an event which she could have either prevented or unintentionally caused and thus Xiao Mei does not play any causal role in the events leading to what is expressed as an adverse situation for her.

An additional reason why experiential predicates are excluded from the rang passive is that there is a general constraint allowing events which are "once-off" or punctual to be encoded while excluding sustained states of affairs and repeated action. Hence, experiential stative events such as zhenxi 'cherish' in (37) are not allowed to co-occur with the rang passive (or causative).

37. \*Ta rang Mali zhenxi-le.  
he RANG (name) cherish:COM

Similarly, sentence (38) with an action verb qin 'kiss', only has the causative non-interference reading as even though 'kiss' is a punctual event, without a verbal classifier it is interpreted as the repeated action of kissing:

38. Xiao Mei rang ta qin-le.  
(name) RANG he kiss COM

Xiao Mei let him kiss (her many times).

Furthermore, if the action is understood to be repeated many times, it is difficult to make an adversative interpretation of the rang construction. Nor is a passive interpretation open to it as a result. The notion of the subject not taking any action whatsoever to avoid undergoing what is supposedly an adversative event in the speaker's view, while plausible for a "once-off" event, becomes increasingly less so when the adversative event befalls her several times as in (38). Thus (38) may only have the causative 'let' reading, since if the situation was truly adversative for Xiao Mei, she would have taken preventive action after the first kiss was forced upon her, or so the "logic" of the rang passive goes. Compare (38) with the rang passive of (39) where the predicate contains a verbal classifier yikou 'one mouth' which clearly defines the event as "once-off" rather than repeated:

39. Xiao Mei rang ta qin-le yikou.  
(name) RANG he kiss:COM one:CL

Xiao Mei got kissed by him (once).

Sentence (39) can be understood as referring to a context where Xiao Mei was not sufficiently vigilant with respect to the agent, enabling him to steal a kiss from her.

For experiential predicates that denote pure states of affairs (ones which do not have a possible active reading), we find that on combination with rang, they result in the interpretation of an experiencer causative.



40.     Ta rang Xiao Mei taoyan le.  
           he RANG (name)     dislike INC  
           He had Xiao Mei disliking (him).

Since an agentive reading is precluded for personal nouns combined with purely stative experiential predicates, neither is there a bei passive counterpart. Recall sentence (124) from Part 1, Section 4, cited here once more for convenience:

124.     \*Mali bei Zhang San xihuan (taoyan) de budeliao.  
           (name) BEI (name)     like (dislike):EXT:extremely

Note that the rang causative co-occurs with the predicate xihuan 'like' only in the exclamation form [q.v. Part II, Section 2.2.2].

41.     Ta zhen rang ren xihuan!  
           he INT RANG one like  
           He really has one liking him!

Similarly, the stative predicate ai de fafeng 'be madly in love with' is interpreted as an experiencer causative with rang but cannot be interpreted as a passive construction with either rang or bei:

RANG Experiencer Causative

42.     Xiao Mei rang Zhang San ai de fafeng  
           (name) RANG (name)     love EXT go:mad  
           Xiao Mei had Zhang San falling madly in love with her.

Passive constructions:

43.     \*Xiao Mei rang (bei) Zhang San ai de fafeng.

Passive constructions in Chinese encode completive events, a semantic property which does not accord with any kind of predicate

denoting a state of affairs that may be sustained indefinitely.  
(q.v. Pt.I 1.3).

Although the rang passive has a passive of bodily effect subsumed under it, as does the bei passive, the former construction may be open to a causative interpretation out of context, unlike the bei passive of bodily effect which is unambiguously passive in meaning. The possibility of a causative interpretation is due to the presence of a third NP in the predicate of the rang passive of bodily effect. The syntactic form

NP<sub>P</sub>      RANG      NP<sub>P</sub>      VP      N<sub>BP</sub>

could be the surface realization of three distinct semantic structures:

- (i) The RANG Passive of Bodily Effect
- (ii) The RANG Speech Act Causative of Request
- (iii) The RANG Speech Act Causative of Permission

The translations for sentence (44) exemplify these three possibilities of interpretation due to its being cited out of context:

44.      You      yitian ta guoran      rang ren jianqu      bianzi.  
         there:be one:day he sure:enough RANG person cut:off plait

Passive

- (i) Sure enough, one day he had his pigtail cut off by someone (to his detriment).

Speech Act Causative of Request:

- (ii) Sure enough, one day he had somebody cut off his pigtail. (He asked somebody to cut it off.)

Speech Act Causative of Permission:

(iii) Sure enough, one day he let somebody cut off his pigtail.

The passive and causative uses of such rang constructions are however disambiguated by the fact that only a rang causative can have the body part term modified by a possessive noun phrase. Compare the acceptability of passive and causative readings for (45) and (46).

45. Wo dao lifayuan qu, rang lifayuan jianqu  
I to hairdresser's go, RANG hairdresser cut:off  
wo de liangge bianzi.  
I GEN two:CL plait

I'm going to the hairdresser's to have the hairdresser cut off my two plaits. (NB - but not the passive reading \*"to have my two plaits cut off by the hairdresser".)

46. Ah Q rang ren jianqu-le ta de bianzi.  
(name) RANG person cut:off:COM he GEN plait

Similarly (46) may have the causative reading of "Ah Q had somebody cut off his pigtail" but not a passive reading "Ah Q had his queue cut off by somebody" (q.v. Part 1.3).

The analysis of rang presented here has set out to demonstrate that the rang passive has a unique semantic structure and must therefore be treated separately from both the bei and jiao passives.

To summarize, the bei passive has a semantic structure encoding the speaker's view that a given passive event is one which adversely affects an undergoer who is viewed as the innocent and helpless victim of circumstance. In contradistinction to this, the rang passive possesses a semantic structure whereby the undergoer is

given a causal role in the passive event. Through the use of the rang passive, the speaker expresses that the undergoer could have taken preventive action to avoid the passive event. Consequently, the adversative event befalling the undergoer is not viewed in as serious a light by the speaker as for bei. It may be further inferred from the use of the rang passive (but not from the use of bei) that the undergoer deserved what befell him or her or was partly to blame in not taking any preventive action. The latter is, however, a contextual inference, and not a component of the semantic structure.

Secondly, it was shown that in contradistinction to Chu's analysis (1974), the semantic structure of the rang passive shares many more components of meaning with the English adversative get passive than does the latter with the bei passive. The bei passive is more appropriately "equated with" and translated by the be passive in English, since as a consequence of their respective semantic structures, both are appropriate for expressing events viewed as serious by the speaker and both are found in non-colloquial domains where the rang and get passives are excluded as well as in colloquial use. The rang and the adversative get passive, on the other hand, share the semantic property of attribution of a causal role to the undergoer of the passive event.

A semantic analysis of the passive construction formed by jiao is presented in the section which follows.

6. THE COLLOQUIAL JIAO PASSIVES

6.1 THE JIAO PASSIVE OF "HOT NEWS"

Nikitina (1958: 218) claims that the jiao and rang passives both have the interpretation of the syntactic subject making the passive event possible:

On formal grounds, the passives with jiao and rang can be considered as a separate case of the causative constructions when the action is directed at the subject. It then has the following semantic representation: A made it possible for B to perform the action over himself.

From the analysis of the rang passive in the preceding section, it could be agreed that an informal description of the passive subject as "making the passive event possible" would not be inappropriate for rang, given the subject's causal role. However, it would be completely erroneous to apply such a description to the jiao passive and even more so to state this as its semantic representation as Nikitina does.

Even though the basic syntactic pattern of the jiao passive is identical to that of the rang and bei passives, I claim, to the contrary, that there are no grounds - either syntactic or semantic - for giving a unified treatment of the rang and jiao passives.

A crucial distinction between these two constructions is that in the jiao passive, the undergoer plays no causal role in the sequence of events. Therefore, with the use of the jiao passive, the speaker cannot express the view that the undergoer "makes the passive event possible" or even "allows it to happen" through not taking any preventive action. I argue in the following analysis,

contrary to this, that the jiao passive can be considered a "hot news" passive.<sup>15</sup>

The discussion of the differences in syntactic behaviour between the three passive constructions precedes the semantic analysis of the jiao passive.

6.2 THE SYNTACTIC DIFFERENTIATION OF THE JIAO PASSIVE FROM THE RANG AND BEI PASSIVES

The basic syntactic form and behaviour of the jiao passive is identical to that of the rang and the bei passives (treated in depth in Part I.1.3). Thus, the jiao passive has the form:

NP	JIAO	NP	VP <sub>COM</sub>
----	------	----	-------------------

47. Gangbi jiao wo shuai-huai - le.  
 pen JIAO I drop:damage : COM

The pen was broken by my dropping it.

Nonetheless, there are three points of difference in the syntactic behaviour of the jiao passive, contrasted with either the rang passive or the bei passive.

First of all, whereas all rang constructions with experiential predicates are interpreted as causatives, the jiao passive behaves identically in this respect to the bei passive by virtue of its semantic structure being equally sensitive to the distinction between experiential predicates which are open to an

---

15 This term is borrowed from McCawley (1971) who coined it for one of the four senses of the perfect tense he distinguished - that of "reporting hot news" (1971: 104). e.g. "Malcolm X has just been assassinated". The jiao passive in Chinese also serves this function, as will be revealed in the ensuing discussion.

active interpretation and those which are purely stative. Compare (48) containing the experiential predicate ai-shang 'fall in love' having the active sense of 'loving' with (49) that has the purely stative predicate ai de fafeng 'be madly in love with'.<sup>16</sup>

48. Nuwang jiao ta de nanpu ai-shang - le.  
queen JIAO she GEN servant fall:in:love:COM  
The queen was loved by her manservant.

49. \*Ta jiao Mali ai de fafeng-le.  
he JIAO (name) love:EXT:go mad :COM

(Note that for this particular example, (49), there is no causative interpretation as there would be for its rang counterpart to the effect "He made Mary be madly in love with him" - an unintentional experiencer causative.) In this way, it behaves similarly to the bei passive.

When jiao co-occurs with stative experiential predicates, which bei is unable to do, only the causative reading is possible. This case holds for both personal NPs as subjects as in (50) and non-personal subjects as in (51).

50. Ta zhen jiao ren xihuan (taoyan).  
he really JIAO one like (dislike)  
He really makes you like (dislike) him.  
(NOT "He is really liked by people")

51. Ta de yangzi jiao ren xihuan.  
he GEN appearance JIAO one like  
His appearance makes you like him.

---

16 Here I mean by the 'active sense of loving' - expressing 'love' in the form of words of adoration etc or deeds of devotion.

On the other hand, for jiao constructions with experiential predicates that do have a possible active reading, the interpretation tends to be that of the passive with personal subjects (i.e. an active reading of the predicate) but that of the causative for sentences with a non-personal NP as the cause (in other words, a stative reading of the predicate is made). The context is the determining factor in these cases.

Passive:

52. Ta jiao ta zui zhixin de pengyou hen-tou - le.  
he JIAO he most close GEN friend hate:through:COM  
He became thoroughly hated by his most intimate friend.

Causative:

53. Zheige huai xingdong jiao ta hen-si - le.  
this:CL bad act JIAO he hate:INT:COM  
This evildoing made him full of hate.

Despite this shared aspect of behaviour of the jiao and bei passives, the jiao passive, identically to the rang passive, has no Europeanized analogue, its semantic structure retaining both features of adversity and 'agentfulness'. Consider (54) and (55) which support these two claims.

Agentless Europeanized Passive:

54. Sirenbang de zuixing bei (\*jiao) qianze-le.  
(name) GEN crime BEI (\*JIAO) condemn:COM  
The crimes of the Gang of Four were condemned.

Europeanized Passive with a Collective Agent:

55. Deng Xiaoping bei (\*jiao) gongchandang huifu - le zhiwei.  
(name) BEI (\*JIAO) communist:party restore:COM position  
Deng Xiaoping was rehabilitated by the Communist Party.



Sentence (55) with jiao could, however, have a causative reading "Deng Xiaoping made the Communist Party restore (him to) his position".<sup>17</sup>

Thirdly, in contrast to both rang and bei, there is no jiao passive of bodily effect. A jiao construction with a postverbal noun denoting a part of the body is interpreted as a causative, if any interpretation can be made at all. (The causative interpretation, as we have seen, was also possible for the preceding example, (55), since it likewise contains a postverbal noun.

56. Ta zai meng-li rang ( jiao) renjia kun-zhu le shou he jiao  
he at dream:in RANG (?JIAO) people tie:fast COM hand & foot

(i) RANG Passive of Bodily Effect: (\*JIAO Passive of Bodily Effect)

He had his hands and feet tied up by them in a dream.

(ii) RANG Causative of Non-Interference: (No JIAO counter-part)

He let them tie up his hands and feet in a dream.

(iii) RANG/JIAO Speech Act Causatives:

He had/made them tie up his hands and feet in a dream.

These findings we have discussed show three ways in which jiao differs in its syntactic behaviour from both bei and rang. We end this section by summarizing them:

Although all three constructions share one basic syntactic form and behave identically with respect to negation, aspectual

---

17 Sentence (55) has nevertheless been starred for the use of jiao, since informants in China found the causative reading politically implausible. Once the personages named in the example are changed, the causative reading does, of course, become acceptable from all points of consideration.

marking and modal verbs, it has been shown first of all, that jiao patterns in the same way as bei for experiential predicates, with only those having an active reading being permitted in the jiao passive, in contrast to rang which has only causative readings with both types of experiential predicate, active and stative.

Secondly, jiao and rang behave identically to one another in not possessing a Europeanized form of their passive constructions, as does bei. Thirdly, jiao differs from both bei and rang in not containing a passive of bodily effect (where a postverbal or retained object occurs) in its complex of constructions.<sup>18</sup> The presence of a postverbal NP in a jiao construction always leads to a causative interpretation.

Therefore, the more complex syntactic behaviour of these three major passive constructions in standard Chinese has been shown to differ. I consider this to be the consequence of their distinct semantic structures, elaborated upon in the final section which follows.

### 6.3 THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIATION OF THE JIAO PASSIVE FROM THE RANG AND BEI PASSIVES

In the introduction to this section, it was pointed out that apart from noting features of usage common to both rang and jiao but not to bei, such as their colloquial nature and the

---

18 The complex of jiao passive constructions subsumes at least three distinct subconstructions:  
I The JIAO Passive with a Person as Undergoer,  
II The JIAO Passive of Possessions, and  
III The JIAO Passive with a Natural Force.  
Although examples of all three constructions are given throughout this section, only the first one is dealt with in detail and provided with a semantic representation.

obligatory expression of the agent, little has been remarked upon the semantic nature of the two colloquial passives. One brief reference concerning the jiao passive has nevertheless been uncovered while searching through the extant literature on this topic.

Jiao is an auxiliary verb made out of a verb. Its meaning is lighter than that of bei.

- Wang Liaoyi (1957: 111)

Needless to say, this does not afford us much insight into the precise semantic characteristics of the jiao passive. Such a description is attempted in the following pages in the hope of filling in this gap to some extent. Here, I argue in favour of considering the jiao passive to be a "hot news" passive.

\* \* \* \* \*

Through the use of the jiao passive, the speaker encodes the unexpected nature of the passive event, consequently making possible the inference of surprise over its occurrence. This unique semantic feature of the jiao passive restricts its application to events which are 'newsworthy' in nature by fact of their having just taken place, relative to the speaker's act of 'announcement'. This is seen clearly in the observation that historical events may not be encoded by jiao.

Recalling the unacceptability of using rang to encode the event of Vietnamese occupation of Kampuchea [5.1 Ex.(9)] due to the implication that Kampuchea did not fully resist its own invasion, neither is the use of jiao acceptable due to the fact that several years have elapsed since the occurrence of this event.

57. Jianbuzhai de yi dapian lingtu bei (\*jiao)  
Kampuchea GEN one large territory BEI (\*JIAO)

Yuenan qinzhan-le.

Vietnam occupy : COM

A large part of Kampuchean territory was occupied by Vietnam.

Events in world history are most appropriately expressed by means of the bei passive as (57) shows, provided that the speaker wishes to convey the adversative nature of the event for the undergoer, and to make the undergoer the subject.

Similarly, in the case of the 1981 Asian championships in table tennis, the bei passive would be suitable for encoding the results of the grand final between Japan and China, as both teams were considered to be strong contenders for the title and the event was of great regional significance. With such a context, we can easily conceive of the event as being serious in nature, especially for the defeated team.

58. Riben dui bei Zhongguo dui da-bai - le.  
Japan team BEI China team hit:lose:COM

The Japanese team was defeated by the Chinese team.

The use of bei causes one to think of the dejected state of the Japanese team after their defeat. In contrast to this, the use of rang would be totally inappropriate for such a context as it would convey not only that the event was insignificant but also that the Japanese team were overly casual in approach to the game and hence, easy to defeat. Succinctly, they did not try hard enough to prevent the Chinese team from defeating them.

The rang passive could be used in a different context, such as that of a rather unimportant match between two rather unimportant teams, neither of whom are considered outstanding in any way. In this context, the match would more likely be a preliminary one with the purpose of sifting out the weaker teams and not a grand final. The implication with respect to the causal role of the Japanese team would equally apply.

Turning to the use of jiao, the emphasis switches to the unexpected nature of the game's result. The jiao passive counterpart of (58) fits a context of there having been no certainty that the Chinese team would win, the Japanese team being considered the stronger and more skilful of the two. It could presumably be used by a supporter of the Japanese team, sympathizing with the adverse state of affairs for the latter while simultaneously expressing surprise that they were defeated.

Furthermore, to return to my initial point, the jiao passive could only be used straight after the event had happened, before it became general knowledge and then historical fact. Thus, a speaker could not appropriately use the jiao passive now to express this event as the surprise element so essential to the meaning of this passive would be lost, unless the speaker were narrating the sequence of events leading up to the defeat of the Japanese team.

Therefore, the jiao passive may only be used for news and not for historical events, which is why I have labelled it the "hot news" passive. One possible conjecture as to why jiao was adapted for use as the exponent of a "hot news" passive could be its verbal meaning of 'tell'. Conjectures aside, the newsworthiness of the

event and the surprise element it encodes provide two reasons for the restriction of the jiao passive to the colloquial register of speech and also for why it could not have developed a Europeanized construction for literary and polemic purposes.

The constraint on the jiao passive requiring events of an unexpected nature may be fulfilled in different ways in terms of actual examples. The unexpectedness of an event may be due to its accidental nature. Compare the three passive constructions given in (59):

59. Ta { bei } xingxingdui chu-jue-le.  
      { jiao }  
      { \*rang }
- he { BEI } firing squad execute:COM  
    { JIAO }  
    { \*RANG }

BEI (i) He was executed by the firing squad.

JIAO (ii) He has just been executed by the firing squad!

Once again, the event depicted by (59) is most appropriately encoded by the bei passive, where the speaker is sympathizing with the adverse state of affairs for the undergoer at the same time as conveying the serious nature of the event. With bei, there is no implication that the subject was executed according to orders other than those of the authorities.

If the jiao passive is used, the implication is either that the firing squad decided on the spur of the moment to put the subject to death, without receiving any instructions to that effect, or that they accidentally executed the wrong person. Both possible interpretations are specific surface manifestations of the component stating the unexpected nature of the event in the deeper semantic structure.

The use of the rang passive in (59) is particularly unsuitable. As pointed out (in Section 5.1), the rang passive does not readily combine with predicates of destruction due to the component which says that the subject and undergoer did not actively try to avoid the event leading to his (her) death. The possible derisive inference of the undergoer as being foolish to let this event happen and the overall less serious tone of the rang passive, both of which are features consequent upon the semantic feature of avoidability, make its use in this context distasteful for most speakers.

In the context provided for (59), where the subject refers to a person who is under detention in a gaol, the generally drawn conclusion would be that his fate was ineluctable and thus not compatible with the interpretation following upon the use of rang.

Therefore, with respect to this feature of avoidability, it is only the bei passive which stands in contrast to the rang passive due to the former's encoding of the event as completely unavoidable on the part of the subject.

Since the component which says that the subject could have avoided or prevented the passive event is not a component in the semantic structure of the jiao passive, the latter may be used to encode the event depicted in (59), the appropriate contexts having been given above. Neither is the serious nature of the event a semantic feature of the jiao passive as far as the adverse effects on the undergoer are concerned. It is always the feature of unexpectedness which takes precedence in the meaning grammaticalized by the latter. This is evident from comparing the appropriate contexts for the bei and jiao passive counterparts exemplified in (60):

60. Ta { bei } xuexiao kaichu-le.  
          { jiao }

she { BEI } school expel:COM  
      { JIAO }

She was expelled by the school.

The bei passive of (60) implies that the student was expelled only after careful deliberation by the school board. - They would not normally expel students without good reason. Secondly, the consequences for the student are understood to be serious in nature in terms of her not knowing what to do with herself afterwards or in terms of effect on her career.

The use of the jiao passive however implies that the school board very hastily made this decision and, most significantly, that the student was not at all prepared for it. This is another way in which the unexpected element of the event is manifested.

It follows upon the preceding discussion that the rang counterpart of (60) is used to express, for example, the ease with which the decision to expel this student was made, given her record of not obeying the rules of discipline and moreover her indifference to this decision. The adverse effects are not viewed as serious ones as we understand that she can fend for herself immediately upon her expulsion.

Similarly, in (61), nothing is implied by the use of the jiao passive about the possible fate of the Gang of Four after their fall from power, unlike the dire consequences for them implied by the use of bei. The interpretation of the unexpected speed with which the Gang of Four were toppled from power is again the uppermost element conveyed by jiao.



61.     Sirenbang { bei } renmin tuifan - le.  
                                  jiao

Gang of Four { BEI } people overthrow:COM  
                                  JIAO

The Gang of Four were overthrown by the people.

The typical interpretation of the referent of the NP Sirenbang 'Gang of Four' as only one of many political parties when it acts as the subject of the jiao passive in (61) as opposed to a politically powerful force which may have caused longlasting oppression when it acts as the subject of the bei passive also belies the fact that the jiao passive has no place in its semantic structure for a component stating the serious nature of the event.

Finally, the element of unexpectedness encoded by jiao is also realized in the interpretation of an agent managing to successfully accomplish a difficult task. This is exemplified by (62) where the apprehension of the spy is understood to have been extremely difficult and consequently that the Security Bureau must be a very competent and efficient workforce after all.

62.     Tewu jiao Gonganju zhua-zhu-le.

spy JIAO P.S.B. arrest:COM

The spy has just been arrested by the Public Security Bureau!

Similarly, through the use of jiao in (63), the speaker expresses that contrary to general expectations, an unusual set of conditions prevailed whereby Li Si usually a placid person managed to give a hooligan a beating.

63.     Liurang jiao Li Si zou-le yidun.

hooligan JIAO (name) beat:COM one:CL

The hooligan has just been given a beating by Li Si!

The unexpected element of the event is attributed then to the lack of certainty concerning Li Si's ability to win a fight with a hooligan, given the level of difficulty in doing so that may generally be assumed to be the case.

In consideration of the semantic features claimed to inhere uniquely in the jiao passive, namely, the unexpected nature of the event and its newsworthiness, in combination with the features of adversity and the explicit expression of the agent which it shares with the bei and the rang passives, I propose that the semantic representation of the jiao passive should take the following form.

THE JIAO PASSIVE OF "HOT NEWS" WITH A PERSON AS UNDERGOER

NP <sub>P</sub>	JIAO	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>COM</sub>
(Undergoer)		(Agent)	
Person A		Person B	

(i) Ta jiao xuexiao kaichu-le.

she JIAO school expel :COM

She has just been expelled by the school!

(ii) Zai 1933 nian, Dongbei bei (\*jiao) Riben.

at 1933 year, Manchuria BEI (\*Jiao) Japan

jundui zhanling - le. (\*historical fact)

army occupy :COM

BEI: In 1933, Manchuria was occupied by the Japanese army.

\*JIAO: \*In 1933, Manchuria has just been occupied by the Japanese army!

(iii) Dongbei jiao guizi zhanling-le!

Manchuria JIAO devil occupy:COM

Manchuria has just been occupied by the Japs!<sup>19</sup>

---

19 Guizi 'devil' was the usual appellation given by the Chinese to their Japanese invaders during the Sino-Japanese War and World War II. It corresponds roughly to 'Japs' or 'Nips' in English.

(iv) \*Ta jiao Mali ai de fafeng. (\*stative)  
he JIAO (name) love EXT go mad

(v) Ta jiao Mali ai-shang - le.  
he JIAO (name) fall:in:love:COM  
He's just had Mary fall madly in love with him!

(vi) \*Ta jiao Xiao Mei { xihuan } - le. (\*stative)  
                                  { taoyan }  
                                  { ai }  
                                  { hen }

he JIAO (name) { like } : COM  
                                  { dislike }  
                                  { love }  
                                  { hate }

(vii) \*Ta jiao danwei jiangli - le. (\*not adversative)  
he JIAO work:unit award : COM

NP<sub>P</sub> JIAO NP<sub>P</sub> VP<sub>COM</sub>

Ta jiao Xiao Mei gan-zou - le.  
he JIAO (name) drive:away : COM

He's just been chased out (of the room) by Xiao Mei!  
(Person A) (Person B)

Assuming you haven't heard about this,  
I say:

Something bad just happened to person A (event Y)  
because person B did something to A  
I think nobody would've thought that Y could  
happen.

The unexpected nature of the event encoded by the jiao passive is represented in the semantic formalization by the component "I think nobody would've thought that this could happen". It is clear from the use of "I" that the viewing of the passive event as one that is unexpected is a function of the speaker. The

presence of this feature is supported by the acceptability of example (iii) as opposed to example (ii) with jiao.

Secondly, the newsworthy nature of the event is encoded as the speaker's viewpoint in the form of an assumption. Moreover, the jiao passive would not be selected to encode a passive event by the speaker unless he or she assumed that it was 'news' for the addressee as well. This is represented in the formalization by the preliminary 'assumption' frame: "Assuming you haven't heard about this, I say:".

The adversative nature of the event encoded by the jiao passive is a semantic feature whose postulation is justified by the unacceptability of example (vii). This is explicated in terms of the component "Something bad happened to person A" in the formula, where person A represents the subject and undergoer of the event.

Examples (iv), (v) and (vi) are supplied to remind the reader that only predicates with an active reading are permissible in the jiao causative, formulated as "person B did something" where "person B" refers to the agent in the semantic representation.

CONCLUSION TO PART II

This analysis of the three passive constructions in standard Chinese - the bei passive and the colloquial rang and jiao passives - has presented the results of an investigation of both their semantic structures and syntactic properties which are determined by these.

It was shown that despite the sharing of a basic syntactic form and set of behaviour with respect to negation, aspectual marking and modal verbs, the rang and jiao passives behave differently from one another and from the bei passive in other features of their syntax. First of all, rang and jiao are used to form complexes of causative constructions which have certain components of meaning in common with their respective passive constructions. By contrast, the passive exponent bei does not have a causative usage.

At this point in the analysis, causative and passive constructions were syntactically and semantically differentiated in order to reveal the identical or unique features of each. It was claimed that the rang passive holds the component of the syntactic subject being viewed as able to prevent the given event in common with two of the rang causatives, specifically the causatives of non-interference. However, this component was interrelated with the other components of the semantic structures of each of the three rang constructions in different ways. Similarly, it was proposed that the jiao passive and the experiencer causatives formed by jiao both contain the component stating the unexpected nature of the event.

Secondly, the rang and jiao passives were shown not to have any related Europeanized construction as does the bei passive. The semantic significance of this is that all the subconstructions of the rang and jiao passives remain uncompromisingly adversative in nature and secondly that they all require the obligatory expression of the agent. The lack of a Europeanized version was thus shown to be predictable from their respective semantic structures.

Thirdly, the rang passive but not the jiao passive subsumes a passive of bodily effect under its general construction sharing the syntax of the bei passive of bodily effect, though not its semantics. This same syntactic construction also has the second possible interpretation of a rang causative when cited out of context. A causative interpretation is the only one possible, however, in the case of jiao sentences of the same syntactic form where a postverbal NP is present: NP-JIAO-NP-V- NP.

The fourth area of difference in syntax is concerned with the predicate types found to co-occur with each passive construction. Only the bei and jiao passives can co-occur with experiential predicates, provided the latter have an active interpretation, for example hen-tou 'to hate thoroughly' as opposed to hen 'hate'. Since all the passive constructions bar those where the event is caused by a natural force are agentive passives (regardless of whether the agent is explicitly mentioned or not), none co-occur with stative predicates such as lei 'tired'. Thus, stative experiential predicates such as xihuan 'like' are also excluded. Contrasting to this, jiao and rang experiencer causatives may co-occur with the latter kind of predicate, but bei, never, since it does not have a causative usage.

Whenever a rang construction makes use of an experiential predicate, whether active or stative in nature, the interpretation is unambiguously one of an experiencer causative and never of a passive. These were the four main areas of more complex syntactic behaviour through which the bei, rang and jiao passive constructions could be differentiated.

Following upon this analysis, the semantic structures of the bei, rang and jiao passives were able to be clearly differentiated, despite the fact that they are otherwise united by the feature of all being "agentful" adversity passives in contrast to the Europeanized passive.

It was shown that the bei and rang passives counterbalanced each other with respect to two particular features. Explicitly encoded in the semantic representation of the bei passive is the component which says that the speaker views the event as serious in both its nature and consequences for the undergoer. An implication of this feature is that the event is viewed as unavoidable on the part of the undergoer who is thus considered to be the innocent victim of fate. If the speaker wishes to sympathize with the plight of the undergoer, this is the passive construction to choose.

In contradistinction to this, the rang passive encodes the undergoer as being able to avoid or prevent the passive event but, at the same time, as not doing so. The undergoer is thus seen as having a causal role in the sequence of events and hence not purely as the passive victim. The implication of this component is that an event which is viewed as avoidable is not considered by the speaker to be serious in nature. Such a claim is supported by the fact that predicates of destruction and death are not appropriately used in the rang passive, due to societal consensus with respect to the

serious nature of this kind of adversity, combined with the understood lack of any conscientious attempt to avoid it on the part of the undergoer.

On juxtaposing the semantic structure of the jiao passive with the bei and rang passives, we find it is neutral with regard to these two features, neither encoding the passive event as avoidable nor encoding it as serious in nature. Instead, the jiao passive encodes the unexpectedness of the event and its highly newsworthy nature. Thus, this construction lends itself readily to the reporting of events of an adversative nature which have just taken place, provided they carry this surprise element, while excluding the speaker from expressing events which have become general knowledge or historical fact.

Although the jiao passive is bereft of any element of sympathizing with the undergoer on the part of the speaker, it may nevertheless be used to express events of destruction, since, unlike the rang passive, it does not have the speaker viewing the event as avoidable, nor does it allow inferences of blame or of a derisive nature to be made. Through the use of the jiao passive, the most important feature which the speaker expresses is that the event which has taken place is contrary to general expectations.



PART III

DATIVE AND BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

FORMED BY GEI

0 INTRODUCTION TO PART III

The verb gei means 'give'.

1. Xiaodong gei-le wo yikuai guojiang juanr  
(name) give:COM me one:CL jam:roll  
Xiaodong gave me a jam roll.

Apart from its use as a main verb, exemplified by (1), gei has another major role in serving as a grammatical exponent, being used to form an array of constructions, for example, passive, dative and benefactive. What is remarkable about its grammatical use is the polarisation of meaning of most of the constructions it forms to express either benefit or adversity: Chao (1968: 330-31) observes that

As the first verb<sup>1</sup> with omissible object, in a V-V series, [gei] is sometimes used like bae [ba],<sup>2</sup> with direction of action outward; sometimes like bey [bei] with direction of action inward, but it also has the force of giving benefit or harm, somewhat like the dative of interest in German.

The grammatical constructions formed by gei can be classified into two main types according to their syntax: Those where gei, acting like an auxiliary verb, is followed by a main verb and those where it acts like a preposition and is followed by a noun.<sup>3</sup> The second type may be further classified into those where

- 
1. Note that Chao considers gei to be functioning as a verb in, for example, the passive and benefactive constructions it forms as opposed to a grammatical exponent as I have described it above.
2. Chao uses a tonal transcription system Gwoyueh Romatzyh to transcribe Chinese - the pinyin equivalents are given in brackets.
3. See also Lü, (1981), pp.196-198 for a comprehensive list of the uses of gei as a grammatical exponent.

the gei + NP syntagma precedes the verb and those where it follows. Some of the constructions in this second class are the topic of analysis in Part III. A brief description of these two classes leads into the analysis proper of the two dative and one benefactive construction formed by gei.

(i) GEI + VP

There are two constructions with this syntactic form, one expressing benefit and the other adversity for the person designated by the subject. In the adversative construction, gei acts like an auxiliary verb which passivizes the main verb.

I. Adversative GEI + VP

SUBJECT - GEI + VP  
(N<sub>AN/IN</sub>)

2. Ni           gei           ting-cuo-le  
you           GEI           hear:wrong:COM

You've misheard.

3. Wu-li    de qifen       gei   po-huai-le.  
room:in REL atmosphere GEI break:ruin:COM

The atmosphere in the room was destroyed.

Many examples of this kind of construction would become ungrammatical if the gei were to be deleted, which indicates that gei is not a superfluous element added at will before the main verb, but rather an integral part of the construction:

4. Ta gei wen-zhu-le.            \*Ta wen-zhu-le  
he GEI ask:stopped:COM       he ask:stopped:COM

He became stuck for an answer.

5. Mali gei xia-zhu-le.                    \*Mali xia-zhu-le.  
 (name) GEI frighten:stopped:COM (name) frighten:stopped:COM  
 Mary was left speechless with fright.

In examples (4) and (5) with animate subjects, the semantic role of the subject as an undergoer can no longer be clearly interpreted once gei is deleted.

The second construction with gei + VP is syntactically identical to the first. It expresses an entirely different meaning, however - that of the subject carrying out a specific action for a purpose or beneficiary that is left unmentioned:

II            Beneficial GEI + VP

SUBJECT - GEI + VP  
 (N<sub>AN</sub>)

6. Wo gei xie gao, ni gei chao!  
 I GEI write draft you GEI copy  
 I'll do the writing of the draft (for it) and you do the copying!

For this construction, the verb must be one of intentional action as opposed to the adversative gei + VP where verbs of happening such as tingcuo 'mishear' and xia 'be frightened' can occur. Thus, the subject of the second construction - beneficial gei + VP is animate by necessity. It may be aptly translated by the verb 'do' in English in conjunction with an -ING verbal noun:

7. Shui longtou huai le, women gei xiu.  
 water tap broken INC we GEI fix  
 The tap is broken, we'll do the fixing of it.  
 Both gei + VP constructions are colloquial.<sup>4</sup>

---

4. Lü, (1981), p.198.

(ii) GEI + NP

The main analysis examines three of the constructions of the second class, where gei precedes a noun rather than a verb. There are however, at least five distinct gei constructions in this class, three of which have the gei + NP occurring preverbally. These three are the benefactive gei construction, the adversative gei passive and the gei of exhortation, exemplified respectively below. All display the same syntactic pattern of

SUBJECT - GEI + NP - VP

a. PREVERBAL GEI + NP

I. The Benefactive GEI Construction

8. Wo gei ni ji-yixia mingtian de shir.  
I GEI you record:TENT tomorrow REL matter  
I'll just note down tomorrow's business for you.

II. The Adversative GEI Passive

9. Ta de yinmou gei ren shibie - le.  
he GEN scheming GEI people discern :COM  
His scheming was seen through by people.

III. The GEI Construction of Exhortation

10. Ni gei wo xiaoxin dianr!  
you GEI me careful bit  
Be a bit more careful!
11. Ni gei wo zou-kai!  
you GEI me leave:apart  
Get out of my way!

Of the preverbal gei + NP constructions, only the benefactive is examined in the main analysis, with, however, passing reference to the adversative gei passive.<sup>5</sup> The benefactive gei construction is contrasted in its use to the constructions formed by WEI + NP 'for the sake of' and TI + NP 'on behalf of' which occur preverbally as well.

b. POSTVERBAL GEI + NP

In the second type of gei construction, the gei + NP syntagma may also be found to occur postverbally in two constructions which are syntactically distinct. Both of these come under discussion in Part III:

I. Dative of Transferral

SUBJECT - VERB-GEI + NP<sub>I.O.</sub> - NP<sub>D.O.</sub>

12. Wo dai-gei ni yihe tang.  
 I carry:GEI you one:CL candy

I've brought you a box of candy.

II. Dative of Intended Benefit

SUBJECT - VP - NP<sub>D.O.</sub> - GEI + NP<sub>I.O.</sub>

13. Xiao Wang yao-le bei piju gei wo.  
 (name) order:COM CL beer GEI me

Xiao Wang ordered a glass of beer for me (to have).

---

5. The topic of adversative passives has been covered in some detail in the two preceding parts dealing with bei, rang and jiao. As I want to examine non-polysemous constructions with distinct syntax that express benefit in Part III, the gei passive is not dealt with here in any depth.

The analysis to be presented below deals with these two dative constructions containing a postverbal gei + NP and the benefactive construction with a preverbal gei + NP.<sup>6</sup>

In Part III, therefore, we turn away from the analysis of polysemy in grammatical constructions to consider instead three grammatical constructions which are distinct in their syntax despite the fact that they share a common syntactic exponent: gei. Here I set out to show that their semantic structures are distinct as a consequence of this and that the semantic structures may be clearly separated one from the other in the same way as the polysemous grammatical constructions examined in Part I and Part II were.

The task of analysing the syntactic constructions formed by gei in standard Chinese is not a new one. Two recent articles have exclusively treated this topic - one by Karen Hermann "Coping with Complex Polysemy: A Comparison of Dative/Benefactive Constructions in Mandarin and Thai" (1979) and the other by Zhu De-xi "Syntactic Problems Associated with the verb gei" (1979).

In the earlier literature on this topic, linguists were primarily concerned with the grammatical classification of the various uses of gei, as either an auxiliary, a preposition, part of a compound verb or as a serial verb.<sup>7</sup>

---

6. The NP following gei will be given the syntactic label of 'indirect object' for ease of reference as it plays a different semantic role in each of the three gei constructions, thus making it difficult to select a descriptive label.

7. The following two linguists address themselves to the problem of defining the syntactic function of gei: Xiang Ruo, "Guanyu gei de cixing" and Yang Xin'an, "Shuo gei". See also Lü Shuxiang, (1981), pp.196-198.

However, merely working out the syntactic labelling for each kind of construction formed by gei is not sufficient to explicate its myriad of usages in modern colloquial Chinese.

In Part III, I propose, therefore, to explicate the semantic features of three major grammatical constructions in standard Chinese that use gei with reference to the detailed syntactic and semantic analysis of this topic presented by Zhu De-xi in his 1979 article. These constructions are the Dative of Transferral with Enclitic gei; the Dative of Intended Benefit with Postverbal gei and the Benefactive Construction with Preverbal gei.

Reference will also be made to the analyses given in Teng (1975), Hermann (1979), Chao (1968) and Li and Thompson (1981) with issue being taken on several major points. Furthermore, in the discussion of the two dative gei constructions, I will make comparisons with Green's (1974) analysis of English dative constructions.

The notation used by Zhu (1979) for these three gei constructions - S<sub>1</sub>, S<sub>2</sub> and S<sub>3</sub> - is retained in my article for the purposes of easy reference and comparison in conjunction with the descriptive labels I have chosen:

S<sub>1</sub>            DATIVE OF TRANSFERRAL WITH ENCLITIC GEI:

SUBJECT	-	VERB	-	GEI	-	INDIRECT OBJECT	-	DIRECT OBJECT
Wo		ji	-	gei		ta		yifeng xin

I sent him a letter.

S<sub>2</sub>            DATIVE OF INTENDED BENEFIT WITH POSTVERBAL GEI:

SUBJECT	-	VERB	-	DIRECT OBJECT	-	GEI	-	INDIRECT OBJECT
Wo		ji-le		yifeng xin		gei		ta

I sent a letter to him.



S<sub>3</sub>      BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTION WITH PREVERBAL GEI:

SUBJECT	-	GEI	-	INDIRECT OBJECT	-	VERB	-	DIRECT OBJECT
---------	---	-----	---	--------------------	---	------	---	------------------

Wo		gei		ta		ji-le		yifeng xin .
----	--	-----	--	----	--	-------	--	--------------

I posted a letter for him.

In alignment with Hermann's analyses of gei, only the non-verbal use of gei is to be investigated, that is, constructions where gei is not employed as the main verb but in the ways I have described above.

Hermann (1979: 106-7) also observes that gei may be used both preverbally and postverbally.<sup>8</sup> The use of gei that she semantically labels as "Goal gei" is pertinent to the present discussion. "Goal gei" typically occurs postverbally, corresponding to the two dative constructions S<sub>1</sub> and S<sub>2</sub> in the above schema. However, on this point, we can make the refinement that S<sub>2</sub> acts like the prepositional dative constructions in English using 'to' to introduce the indirect object, whereas S<sub>1</sub> resembles the prepositionless ditransitive constructions in English. In the S<sub>1</sub> construction gei functions as a verbal enclitic:

S<sub>1</sub>      DATIVE OF TRANSFERRAL WITH ENCLITIC GEI:

14.      Wo jieshao gei ni yige pengyou.

?I'll introduce you a friend. (substandard English)

---

8.      Hermann's description of the uses of gei and the terminology adopted derives from Shou-hsin Teng, (1975), A Semantic Study of Transitivity Relations in Chinese.

S<sub>2</sub> DATIVE OF INTENDED BENEFIT WITH POSTVERBAL GEI:

15. Wo jieshao yige pengyou gei ni.  
I'll introduce a friend to you.

Contrasting to these two postverbal uses of gei, is that of gei used preverbally. Hermann calls this its 'benefactive' use. (This corresponds to construction S<sub>3</sub> above.)

S<sub>3</sub> BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTION WITH PREVERBAL GEI:

16. Wo gei ni jieshao yige pengyou.  
(i) I'll introduce a friend for you.

She observes that this construction is open to two further interpretations:

- (ii) I'll introduce a friend to you.  
(iii) I'll introduce a friend instead of you.

Hermann (1979: 106) states that the uses of gei exemplified by (i) and (iii) are equivalent to the use of wei, 'for the sake of', and ti, 'instead of', respectively in Modern Chinese.

According to this analysis, whenever gei occurs preverbally, three formally identical gei constructions result, each with its own distinct meaning. These are the syntactic facts leading to Hermann's claim of polysemy for gei.

In contradistinction to her claim regarding the polysemy of preverbal gei (S<sub>3</sub>), I will show that it is necessary to postulate one unified and distinct semantic representation for this construction - distinct from those employing ti and wei. Moreover, the semantic representation for the benefactive gei construction differs from those of the two dative gei constructions. - Each construction is discrete and unique.

Furthermore, equation of the meaning of the gei morpheme found in these constructions with any of 'for, 'to' or 'on behalf of' and 'instead of' reveals a lack of precision in semantic analysis. In sum, I argue against Hermann's conclusion that pre-verbal gei is three-ways ambiguous as a grammatical construction.

Secondly, in relation to other analyses of gei, it will be pointed out that Chao (1968), Li and Thompson (1981) and Zhu (1979) have one feature in common: All share the belief that lists of verbs can be drawn up and then allocated to each gei construction. The implication is that the choice of the particular gei construction determines the verb class which can co-occur with it and then by examining these categories of verbs, the meaning and use of each gei construction can be ascertained.

Chao classifies verbs into four groups with respect to their behaviour preceding an enclitic gei which is here described as the  $S_1$  construction. According to his analysis, verbs of giving can be classified into those which take an obligatory or optional enclitic gei. Secondly, he points out that verbs of taking are excluded from this construction and that other verbs co-occur with it depending on 'the direction to or from the indirect object' (1968: 317). Sentence (17) exemplifies his second point about verbs of taking:

$S_1$  : DATIVE OF TRANSFERRAL (NO PAUSE) WITH ENCLITIC GEI

17.     \*Wo mai gei ni yiben shu  
       I buy GEI you one:CL book.

Li and Thompson (1981) provide a similar analysis in their reference grammar of Chinese (1981: 374-9) while Zhu (1979) expands on this type of analysis to investigate the verb classes occurring in these three different gei constructions.

The method of analysis adopted here differs from the preceding four analyses in one crucial aspect: I believe that the co-occurrence of any lexical item may only be predicted after an explication of the overall meaning encoded by each gei construction has been given. Only after this task is complete can any adequate explanation of, for example, the associated verb classes be provided. Moreover, not only can co-occurring verb classes be simply accounted for, but also other related syntactic phenomena.

This approach is based on the belief that syntactic constructions must be explicated first of all in semantic terms, a principle which has been consistently argued for throughout each section of this thesis.

I believe that by explicating the overall meaning encoded by each gei construction in terms of semantic primitives and near primitives rather than by exclusively examining associated verb classes or drawing up verb lists, all exemplifications of gei sentences (actual or potential) can be accounted for in a systematic way. The necessity for verb lists is thus eliminated. A similar case was argued against the use of the verb classification method in the analysis of the bei passive in Section 1.1 of Part I.

The above-mentioned references on the topic of gei also explore the possibility of mutual substitutability of verb classes. The facts turned up by using this method are not overlooked in my analysis, as the semantic definitions simultaneously show the underlying relationship between each gei construction, by way of shared semantic components. Moreover, this is effected without recourse to any kind of transformational analysis. Finally, it is also implicit in this analysis that the postulated semantic

representations accurately predict the correct usage of each gei construction according to the context.

1 THE DATIVE CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSFERRAL WITH ENCLITIC GEI  
: S<sub>1</sub>

SUBJECT - VERB - GEI - INDIRECT - DIRECT  
OBJECT OBJECT

Wo ji - gei ta yifeng xin.  
I send : GEI him one:CL letter

I sent him a letter.

The first dative construction formed by gei to be examined expresses the transferral of an object from one person to another. The subject denotes the person who effects this transferral and the indirect object, the person who is to receive the transferred object. The indirect object follows immediately upon the morpheme gei which is itself inseparable from the main verb which precedes it. Chao (1968: 317) considered that the function of gei as an enclitic to the preceding verb was the distinctive syntactic feature of S<sub>1</sub>.<sup>9</sup>

The precise syntactic status of gei in this construction is hard to determine and much debated in the extant literature. Countering the description of gei as a morphological constituent of a verb compound or as an enclitic, some analyses have sought to pin down its syntactic function by regarding it as forming a

---

9. Here I adopt Chao's analysis of gei in this construction as functioning syntactically as an enclitic, based on his definition of enclitics (1968: 120): "An enclitic ... is a form which is phonetically attached to the preceding (or following) word, but grammatically attached to a longer preceding (or following) construction."

prepositional construction with the following indirect object that acts as a complement to the verb (e.g. Yang Xin'an, 1960: 66).

Whatever its syntactic status may be, one striking syntactic observation which can be made about construction  $S_1$  is that neither gei nor its following indirect object can be deleted from it, contrasting to the case for  $S_2$  and  $S_3$  where the GEI + Indirect Object segment appear to be "optional" syntactically:

21.           \*Wo ji-gei yifeng xin. (No indirect object.)  
               I send:GEI one:CL letter

22.           \*Wo ji yifeng xin. (GEI + Indirect Object phrase  
               I send one:CL letter           entirely deleted.)

Only the initial example given for  $S_1$  Wo ji gei ta yifeng xin 'I sent him a letter' is acceptable as what we could regard as the minimal form of this construction. Contrasting to this,  $S_2$  and  $S_3$ : Wo ji-le yifeng xin gei ta 'I sent a letter to him' and Wo gei ta ji-le yifeng xin 'I posted a letter to him' respectively; may both be reduced to Wo ji-le yifeng xin - 'I sent a letter', one implication being that the semantic representations will need to account for this distinguishing syntactic feature of  $S_1$ .

The semantic representation for  $S_1$  is stated first of all in full prior to the justification of each individual semantic component which is presented in the following discussion.

$S_1$            THE DATIVE CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSFERRAL WITH ENCLITIC GEI:

SUBJECT	VERB	GEI	INDIRECT OBJECT	DIRECT OBJECT
<u>Ta</u>	<u>jiao</u>	<u>- gei</u>	<u>wo</u>	<u>yiba yaoshi.</u>
he	hand	: GEI	me	one:CL key

He handed me a key.

Person A

Person B

Thing X

Assuming that thing X is in place L with person A  
I say:

Person B came to have thing X  
because person A did something to X  
because A wanted B to have thing X.

1.1 SEMANTIC DESCRIPTION OF  $S_1$

1.1.1 Presupposition of the Direct Object as being with the  
Subject

The direct object in construction  $S_1$  designating the  
object to be transferred ("thing X") is semantically restricted to  
entities which prior to or on the point of the subject's action are  
understood to be with or in the same place as the subject who is the  
person who effects the transferral. The following sentences are  
used to support this claim, which are semantically unacceptable due  
to the interpretation of the object only being with the subject on  
the completion of the subject's action, that is, as a result of the  
action:

18. \*Xiao Wang zuo-gei ta mama yidun fan.  
(name) make:GEI his mum one:CL meal  
(?Xiao Wang made his mum dinner.)

19. \*Mali mai-gei wo yiliang qiche.  
(name) buy:GEI me one:CL car  
(Mary bought me a car.)

This object is not necessarily a possession of the  
subject, however, as shown by (20) where the books are more likely to  
belong to "me", the indirect object, than to the subject, Xiao Wang:

20. Xiao Wang huan-gei wo sanben shu.  
(name) return:GEI me three:CL book  
Xiao Wang gave me back three books.



Hence, it cannot be claimed that the entity to be transferred belongs to the subject, person A, but only that 'thing X' is in the same place as the subject before the subject acts upon it in order to transfer thing X to the indirect object, person B. This point is clearly illustrated by the following example, where it would be entirely inappropriate to make the claim that the direct object 'soup' is a possession of the subject:

23.        Ta yao-gei      wo yishao      tang.  
          he ladle:GEI   me one:CL      soup  
  
          He ladled me a spoon of soup.

In Chapter 2, it will be shown that the direct object referred to in the dative construction of intended benefit,  $S_2$ , is by no means presupposed as being with the subject, person A, prior to A's action. This is a major semantic distinction between the two datives and its ramification for  $S_1$  is that only verbs which express "transferral" or whose meaning in the context of this construction is compatible with the interpretation of "transferral" are permitted in  $S_1$ .

#### 1.1.2        Verb Classes in $S_1$

Several linguists such as Zhu De-xi (1979); Chao Yuen Ren (1968) and Charles Li and Sandra Thompson (1981) have chosen to analyse the gei constructions in terms of the verb classes which co-occur with them.

Li and Thompson (1981: 384) classify verbs into four classes according to whether they can co-occur with  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$  and the Double Object construction. These are the verbs of 'transaction' which take gei either optionally or obligatorily;

verbs of 'deprivation' and verbs of 'linguistic communication', neither of the latter two classes being able to occur in either of these two gei constructions. This parallels to some extent Chao's classification of verbs according to whether or not they can co-occur with an enclitic gei where Chao (1968: 317) claims that

In general, verbs of the 'send', 'give' type take (a) an obligatory or (b) an optional bound geei; (c) verbs like 'take (from)', 'ask (of)', and 'call' do not take geei; and (d) other verbs take or do not take geei according to the direction to or from the indirect object.

However, Li and Thompson (1981: 374-9) make their classification of verbs according to occurrence in the three different syntactic constructions noted above: The two dative constructions formed by gei - S<sub>1</sub> and S<sub>2</sub>, and the Double Object Construction (which requires no gei but has the same order otherwise as S<sub>1</sub>: Subject-Verb-Indirect Object-Direct Object):

Double Object Construction:

SUBJECT	VERB	INDIRECT OBJECT	DIRECT OBJECT
Ta	song	wo	yihe tang.
he	present	I	one:CL sweets

He gave me a box of sweets (as a present).

It proves to be the case that a large number of the verbs of 'transaction' as they call them such as fù 'pay', jiè 'lend', peí 'compensate' and cì 'bestow' may occur in all three constructions, dative and Double Object, whereas other verbs of this class such as jiāo 'deliver', mài 'sell', xiě 'write' and dài 'bring' may only be used in S<sub>1</sub> and S<sub>2</sub> in conjunction with gei. Why is it that verbs like fù 'pay' and cì 'bestow' can occur in the Double Object Construction without the morpheme gei preceding the indirect object

while mai 'sell' and xiě 'write' cannot? Although the Double Object Construction is outside the scope of the present discussion, I believe that Li and Thompson have admitted defeat prematurely in concluding that "which verbs require gei and which verbs allow it optionally is something that simply has to be learned for each verb (1981: 384)".

It is not a question of 'optional' as opposed to 'obligatory' gei: In constructions  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , gei is an invariant syntactic feature, whereas in the Double Object Construction it is not one of the required syntactic elements. Each of these three syntactic constructions needs to be analysed separately to determine its semantic structure and then we can ascertain why certain verbs are compatible with the dative gei constructions  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  yet not in the third construction they examine the Double Object Construction.

In this section and the next such an analysis will be carried out for the dative gei constructions  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , showing that they cannot be defined in terms of the co-occurring verb classes alone. In fact, it is quite inadequate to characterize  $S_1$  in terms of the main verb being restricted to verbs of giving, the implication of both Chao's and Li and Thompson's analysis. Even more clear in its standpoint is Zhu De-xi's explicit statement (1979: 82) that  $S_1$  is restricted to verbs of giving. [He then goes on (1979: 83ff) to make semantic generalizations about the verb classes found to occur in the other two gei constructions and the Double Object Construction as well.]

These kinds of analyses only partially account for the facts. One of the reasons why different sets of verb classes are used, for example, in  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  can be explained in terms of the

semantic nature of the direct object: As the direct object ("thing X") is not presupposed in  $S_2$  not only verbs of giving can be used in it but also a wide range of verbs including verbs of getting and taking, a feature which the verb classification approach should account for but which it fails to do. Recalling that  $S_2$  has the syntactic form: Subject-Verb-Direct Object-GEI-Indirect Object, consider the following examples:

$S_2$             DATIVE OF INTENDED BENEFIT WITH POSTVERBAL GEI:

25.            Ta mai dian shuiguo gei bingren.

He buy some fruit    GEI patient

He bought some fruit for the patient.

26.            Ta qiang le yige weizi gei wo.

he snatch COM one:CL seat GEI me

He claimed a seat for me.

These verbs are excluded from  $S_1$  the dative of transferral, since they do not presuppose a direct object:

27.            \*Ta mai-gei bingren shuiguo.

he buy:GEI patient fruit

28.            \*Ta qiang-gei wo yige weizi.

he snatch:GEI me one:CL seat

As can be seen, the semantic component stating the presupposition that thing X is in place L with person A partially accounts for this fact as does a second component: "Person A wanted person B to come to have thing X". - The combined semantic force of these two components results in verbs of intentionally taking away, getting and acquiring all being incompatible with this construction.

A second reason why it is inadequate to characterize  $S_1$  as a construction which is restricted to verbs of giving is that in fact not only verbs of giving are permissible in it: Zhu points out (1979: 82) the following 'exceptions': the verbs xiě 'write', liú 'keep', jiǎn 'pick up (with chopsticks)' and yǎo 'ladle' (his examples, my translations and numbering):

29.        Ta xie-gei xiaozhang yifeng xin.  
          he write:GEI principal one:CL letter  
          He wrote the principal a letter.
30.        Ta liu-gei Xiao Wang yige weizi.  
          he keep:GEI (name) one:CL seat  
          He kept Xiao Wang a seat.
31.        Ta jian-gei wo yikuai yu.  
          he pick up:GEI me one:CL fish  
          He selected me a piece of fish (with his chopsticks).
32.        Ta yao-gei wo yishao jiangyou.  
          he ladle:GEI me one spoon soy:sauce  
          He ladled me a spoon of soy sauce.

Such evidence shows that we need a much more precise semantic explication for  $S_1$  than that of paraphrasing it as a construction which is restricted to verbs of giving. As foreshadowed at the outset we can account for the fact that there are a "number of verbs" that do not contain the basic meaning of 'give', yet are compatible with the interpretation of transferral by stating the overall meaning of the  $S_1$  construction by means of the semantic representation rather than trying to list all the verbs which are found to occur in it. The semantically complex term 'give' is not

used in the representation as a result of this objective. In fact only the verb 'do' is used which does not specify the kind of action. The other components make it clear that person B "comes to have thing X" as a result of both person A's intention to cause this and A's subsequent action, (29) "The principal comes to have the letter that he wrote to him" (30) "Xiao Wang comes to have the seat that he kept for her" (31) "I come to have a piece of fish that he selected for me" and (32) "I come to have a spoon of soy sauce on my food that he ladled out for me" respectively. In sum, this formula can predict accurately that verbs like xiě 'write' and liú 'keep' are compatible with  $S_1$  while generally excluding verbs such as qiang 'snatch' and mai 'buy' and without needing to resort to verb classification.

1.1.3 The Completiveness and Causativity of  $S_1$  with respect to 'Causing to Have'

It was mentioned above that Chao (1968) analyses gei in  $S_1$  as an enclitic to the verb rather than viewing it, for example, as forming a prepositional phrase with the following indirect object as does Yang Xin'an (1960). The close syntactic relationship between the verb and the morpheme gei which immediately follows upon it is indicative of the fact that gei is partially semantically responsible for encoding that the event designated by the  $S_1$  expression is completed. In signifying that a change of state has been effected, specifically one where person B (designated by the indirect object) has received thing X (designated by the direct object), it is acting in a similar way to resultative verb complements such as xiě-wán 'finish writing', literally: 'write: finish' and chǎo-hú 'burn (food)', literally: 'fry:burn'. The

resultative verb compounds in Chinese all encode causation of some sort whether it be change of state or change of location as does the verb + GEI complex in  $S_1$ .<sup>10</sup>

That the verb and the morpheme gei are so closely bound together that they are inseparable is verifiable from the fact that no aspectual marking may intervene between these two elements:

33.           \*Ta ji-le       gei wo yifeng xin.  
              he send:COM GEI me one:CL letter

In (33), the completive aspect marker le is interposed between the verb 'send' and the morpheme gei, resulting in an ungrammatical sentence. Note however that  $S_2$  may freely take aspectual marking on its verb; which means that the combination of gei and -le is possible while not being tautologous:

34.           Ta ji-le yifeng xin gei wo.  
              he send:COM one:CL letter GEI me  
  
              He sent a letter to me.

In fact, without any aspectual marking whatsoever,  $S_1$  is interpreted as completive as (35) shows:

35.           Ta ji-gei wo yifeng xin.  
              he send:GEI me one:CL letter  
  
              He sent me a letter.

When  $S_2$  has no aspectual marking, it is interpreted as present tense in English, that is, as a non-completive expression:

---

10. Li and Thompson (1981: 205) consider the gei of  $S_1$  to be a "perfectivizing expression" which takes the place of the completive aspect marker -le, as distinct from the claim I make above. Note also that they call -le the "perfective aspect marker".

36. Ta ji yifeng xin gei wo.

He is sending a letter to me (but it hasn't been sent yet).

This feature of  $S_1$  as opposed to  $S_2$  serves as a syntactic justification of the claim made in Section II that  $S_1$  is causative in a way that  $S_2$  is not. Briefly,  $S_1$  encodes that person B does receive the transferred object ("Person B comes to have thing X because of A's action") whereas  $S_2$  encodes only that person A intends for person B to have a certain object. Thus, in example (34) above of  $S_2$ , with the completive aspect marker -le only the action of sending the letter is understood to be a completed (and past) event while there is no corresponding implication of the indirect object "me" having received the letter. This overall meaning of  $S_2$  contrasts to its  $S_1$  counterpart, example (35), where the interpretation is rather that of the letter being both successfully sent and received.



2 THE DATIVE CONSTRUCTION OF INTENDED BENEFIT WITH  
POSTVERBAL GEI : S<sub>2</sub>

SUBJECT - VERB - DIRECT - GEI - INDIRECT  
          PHRASE OBJECT           OBJECT

Wo           ji-le    yifeng xin    gei        ta.  
I            send:COM one:CL letter GEI        him

I sent a letter to him.

---

The two main standpoints regarding the syntactic status of gei in the S<sub>2</sub> dative construction are that

- (i) gei is the second verb of a serial verb construction
- (ii) gei forms a prepositional phrase with the following NP.<sup>11</sup>

Contrasting to the syntactic configuration for S<sub>1</sub>, the second dative construction formed by gei has the direct object (yifeng xin 'a letter') placed directly after the verb and the indirect object denoting the person who is to receive the transferred object positioned in the final syntactic slot after gei. The order of the direct object and the indirect object for S<sub>1</sub> are thus inverted in S<sub>2</sub> in a way that closely parallels the difference in syntax for dative constructions with and without to in English. ("I sent him a letter" vs "I sent a letter to him"). However, in Chinese, the particle gei is present in both constructions whereas the preposition to is only found in the English construction with an external dative.<sup>12</sup>

---

11. For example, Chao (1968) espouses the first point of view and Xiang Ruo, "Guanyu gei de cixing", Zhongguo Yuwen, 1960:2, p.64, the second.

12. The terms "external dative", "internal dative" (or "prepositionless dative") are taken from G. Green, Semantics and Syntactic Regularity, 1974.

The full semantic representation for construction S<sub>2</sub> is once again presented at the outset:

S<sub>2</sub>: THE DATIVE CONSTRUCTION OF INTENDED BENEFIT WITH POSTVERBAL GEI:

SUBJECT - VERB - DIRECT - GEI - INDIRECT  
          PHRASE  OBJECT                  OBJECT

Ta                  jiao-le yiba yaoshi gei                  wo.

he                  hand:COM one:CL key  GEI                  me

He handed a key to me.

Person A                  Thing X                  Person B

Person A does something  
because A wants person B to come to have a thing X  
that B can do something with  
Person A wants something good to happen to person B  
because of this

2.1 SEMANTIC DESCRIPTION OF S<sub>2</sub>

2.1.1 The Components of "Usefulness" and "Benefit"

The first semantic distinction between the two dative constructions formed by gei which is of interest for our discussion is that it is encoded in S<sub>2</sub> as opposed to S<sub>1</sub> that the motivation for the subject's action is one of intending to cause the indirect object (person B) to come to have something which B can use, and thereby benefitting B. This component is not present in the semantic representation for S<sub>1</sub>.

At the same time, let us examine the following closely related question with respect to S<sub>2</sub>: Would the intentional action of the subject (Person A) always result in a beneficial state of affairs for the person designated by the indirect object (person B)? If this proves to be the case and we can show that 'benefit' is a semantic invariable of the construction, then it must also be included in the semantic representation as another feature which distinguishes S<sub>2</sub> from S<sub>1</sub>.

Compare the two following sentences which are used to expand upon this point. Only (38) can be considered as an example of  $S_2$ :

37.        \*Zhang San chao-hu-le     cai gei Mali.  
          Zhang San fry:burn:COM food GEI Mary  
  
          (Zhang San burnt the food for Mary.)

38.        Zhang San chao-hao-le     cai gei Mali.  
          Zhang San fry:finish:COM food GEI Mary  
  
          Zhang San fried a meal for Mary.

Examples (37) and (38) are isomorphic in syntax: They contain the same kind of verb phrase composed of a resultative verb compound ('fry:burn'; 'fry:finish'), a completive aspect marker and a related object ('food'). Only (38) however, fulfills all the semantic conditions for  $S_2$ . The question is then, is sentence (37) unacceptable due to the encoding of Zhang San causing an undesirable state of affairs for Mary: one where she is unable to eat the food which has been cooked for her, given its inedible condition or is it unacceptable for some other reason?

It is not only the undesirability of the resultant situation which causes sentence (37) to be unacceptable but also the kind of situation which results of there being nothing edible left which can be given to Mary, that is, nothing "she can do anything with" such as eat.

Two of the factors which determine the semantic well-formedness of an example are thus the usefulness of the object for person B (the indirect object) and the beneficial nature of the state of affairs that would be created for person B through A's

action. Both can be deduced from the difficulty of finding an appropriate context for (39):

39.       ??Zhang San sha-le yige ren gei Mali.  
          Zhang San kill:COM one:CL person GEI Mary  
          (Zhang San killed a person for Mary.)

It is difficult to interpret how the murder of some unknown innocent could cause a beneficial state of affairs for Mary unless it were in the context of some gangster underworld and yet even in this context (39) remains "awkward" for according to the semantics of the S<sub>2</sub> gei dative, it can only be inferred that the killing was intended to provide Mary with a body that she could put to some use. This inference is revealed when we compare (39) with (40) below:

40.       Zhang San sha-le yizhi ji gei Mali.  
          (name)   kill:COM one:CL chicken GEI (name)  
          Zhang San killed a chicken for Mary (to have).

For (40) it is easy to imagine an appropriate context with regard to the component of "usefulness": one where Mary cooks the chicken for dinner.

In the macabre context of black magic and devilry, presumably, sentence (39) would be completely acceptable as a use for the dead body could be interpreted (as a sacrifice) and thus also the intended benefit of the subject's action for Mary, the witch.

The meaning given by the English translation of (39) would be better encoded by the wei construction in Chinese, which does not contain the component of intended benefit - of the

subject's wanting to cause a beneficial state of affairs - but expresses only that the subject's action is symbolic of his feelings towards Mary. Consequently an acceptable example is obtained:

41.        Zhang San wei Mali sha-le yige ren.  
          (name)    WEI (name) kill:COM one:CL person  
          Zhang San killed a person for Mary's sake.

(Further examples of the wei construction and the benefactive gei construction [S<sub>3</sub>] will be encountered below before their full discussion in Chapter 3.)

I conclude then, that there is a component of 'intended benefit' - that the resultant state of affairs would be beneficial for the indirect object, inhering in the meaning of this construction and one that is separate from anything which could be inferred from the component which states: "A wants B to come to have a thing X that B can do something with".

Both these aforementioned components are responsible for excluding the following sentences as potential S<sub>2</sub>:

42.        \*Zhang San diu-le yiba yaoshi gei Mali.  
          (name)    lose:COM one:CL key    GEI (name)  
          (\*Zhang San lost a key for Mary [to have].)

43.        \*Zhang San guan-le deng gei Mali.  
          (name)    close:COM light GEI (name)  
          (\*Zhang San turned off the light for Mary [to have].)

The events depicted in these two examples do not result in there being any object or "thing" that could be given to Mary, and consequently no beneficial state of affairs for her can be interpreted either. Hence, there must be a tangible "something"

which is identifiable in each example of this construction and crucially, one which person A wants person B to have although this object is not a presupposed one. The latter point implies that the thing needs to be a 'giveable' object in the first place. These combined factors explain why (44) is unacceptable, yet (45), the symbolic wei construction is to the contrary, acceptable:

44.        \*Zhang San pa-le yizuo shan gei Mali.  
          (name)       climb:COM one:CL mountain GEI (name)  
  
          (\*Zhang San climbed a mountain for Mary [to have].)

SYMBOLIC WEI CONSTRUCTION:

45.        Zhang San wei Mali pa le yizuo shan.  
          Zhang San climbed a mountain for Mary's sake.

The event of climbing a mountain does not meet the semantic requirement of  $S_2$  that allows the interpretation of the subject Zhang San, wanting Mary to come to have something in her possession as the result of his action, since there could be nothing for Zhang San to give Mary as a result of such an activity.

Thus even if we have a "tangible something" ("a mountain"), the construction as a whole must conspire to express that person A intends for B to have it as well, that is, thing X is something which can be given to B otherwise the particular example will be ill-formed semantically.

In discussing the nature of the "thing" A wants B to have, we cannot overlook the question of presupposition or what is commonly termed the 'pre-existence' of the object. Obviously, person A must have something which can be given to B, but is this thing understood to be in the same place as A, that is "with" A at the moment of A's action? This question is examined in the following section.

2.1.2 No Presupposition of the Direct Object as being with the subject

In fact, the existence of the direct object ("thing X") is not presupposed by the speaker in the case of construction  $S_2$  as opposed to  $S_1$  where it is explicit in the semantic structure: "Assuming that thing X is in place L with person A". Such a component is entirely lacking in the semantic structure of  $S_2$ : We have seen in the preceding section that  $S_1$  encodes the transferral of an object from one person to another, a grammaticalized meaning which requires a presupposed object.  $S_2$  encodes rather than the purpose of the subject's (A's) action is to achieve a situation whereby A will be able to cause person B to have something which will subsequently be of use to B. That this thing is not necessarily with the subject prior to the action is evident from the examples below:

46. Zhang San da-le yijian maoyi gei Mali.  
(name) knit:COM one:CL jumper GEI (name)  
Zhang San knitted a jumper for Mary (to have).

47. Zhang San qiang-le yige weizi gei Mali.  
(name) grab:COM one:CL seat GEI (name)  
Zhang San claimed a seat for Mary (to have).

In both cases, the "thing X" which Zhang San wants Mary to have cannot be considered to be with him prior to his action: The jumper does not 'exist' until he finishes the activity of knitting it nor is there a seat to give Mary until the action of claiming one is undertaken. Thus, presupposition of the existence of the object is not part of the meaning of  $S_2$ . What is central, invariant and thus an integral part of the semantic structure is

that whether or not thing X is owned, acquired or made by person A, it is intended by A for person B to have.

2.1.3 Verb Classes in  $S_2$

Zhu states that whereas  $S_1$  is restricted to verbs of giving, three classes of verbs are permissible in  $S_2$ : verbs of giving, verbs of getting and verbs of creation. These are labelled  $V_a$ ,  $V_b$  and  $V_c$  respectively. Since only the  $S_2$  construction with  $V_a$  verbs (verbs of giving) may be freely transformed into  $S_1$ , Zhu claims (1979: 83) that  $S_2(V_b)$  and  $S_2(V_c)$  form an opposing and distinct sentence construction to  $S_2(V_a)$ . This claim is based on the following kind of evidence showing that a transformational relationship between  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  holds only for the  $V_a$  class of verbs:

$S_2$	$S_1$
SUBJECT-VP-D.O.-GEI-I.O.	SUBJECT-VERB-GEI-I.O.-D.O.
$V_a$ = Verbs of giving	
48. <u>Wo song yijian maoyi gei ta.</u> I present one:CL jumper GEI him I gave a jumper to him (as a present).	<u>Wo song-gei ta yijian maoyi.</u> I present:GEI him one:CL jumper I gave him a jumper (as a present).
$V_b$ = Verbs of getting	
49. <u>Wo mai yijian maoyi gei ta.</u> I buy one:CL jumper GEI him I bought a jumper for him.	* <u>Wo mai gei ta yijian maoyi.</u> I buy GEI him one:CL jumper
$V_c$ = Verbs of creation	
50. <u>Wo da yijian maoyi gei ta.</u> I knit one:CL jumper GEI him I knitted a jumper for him.	* <u>Wo da gei ta yijian maoyi.</u> I knit GEI him one:CL jumper



From this, Zhu concludes (1979: 83) that the inability of verbs of getting and creation in  $S_2$  to undergo transformation into  $S_1$  reflects "an opposition between verbs which express giving and those which do not". This is a well-grounded semantic observation which throws more light, I believe, on the overall meaning of the  $S_1$  construction as being a construction which exclusively expresses "transferral".

The consequence of Zhu's dividing  $S_2$  into two separate syntactic constructions is that we forego a unified treatment of it. Indeed, the observation that some examples of the gei  $S_2$  dative construction may be transformed into the gei  $S_1$  dative construction is indicative of two facts:

- (i) certain components of meaning are shared by these two constructions such as the intention to cause person B to come to have thing X
- (ii) as a consequence of (i), certain lexical items are compatible with both constructions such as verbs of "giving".

The way in which single lexical items are melded into the overall meaning of each construction is, however, entirely different. It is the semantic representation for each construction which can give us the "overview" so to speak, showing how each element works together to fulfill the semantic requirements.

#### 2.1.4 Causativity versus Causative Intention: Causation of Having and Causation of Benefit

A further semantic consideration which Zhu uses to establish the opposition between verbs of giving on the one hand and verbs of getting and creation on the other is that verbs of giving

seem only to imply one action when used in gei constructions whereas the other two classes involve two actions. Zhu explains (1979: 83) that in the  $S_2$  example Zhang San mai yisuo fangzi gei Li Si ("Zhang San sold a house to Li Si"), "the process of Zhang San selling a house is one where the house is transferred from Zhang San to Li Si - a process of giving". However, in the second example of  $S_2$  with a verb of getting, mai 'buy': Zhang San mai yisuo fangzi gei Li Si ("Zhang San bought a house for Li Si"), Zhu goes on to say that "Zhang San's buying a house and Zhang San giving Li Si a house are two mutually separate affairs". Zhu then points out that the same situation applies for verbs of creation occurring in  $S_2$  as well: In the example: Wo da yijian maoyi gei ta ("I knitted a jumper for him"), "knitting the jumper and giving it to him are two things".

To counterargue, I would point out that the number of actions carried out by person A (Zhang San) is not encoded as part of the meaning of construction  $S_2$ . In other words, how many actions are involved with the purpose of causing object X to come to be in B's possession is not an essential component of meaning. This is clear from the many different examples of  $S_2$  which have already been given such as: "He handed a key to me"; "Zhang San knitted a jumper for Mary, bought a house for Li Si" and "Zhang San claimed a seat for Mary": 'Handing a key to someone' may only involve one simple action but in examples such as 'buying a house for someone', we can imagine that many distinct actions took place before the house was finally given to Li Si such as visiting real estate agents, looking at houses, arranging finance at the bank and signing the contract.

Some other examples involve activity verbs such as dǎ maóyī 'knitting a jumper' and zuò fàn 'cooking a meal'. How can these be described in terms of one discrete action which precedes an action of giving?

It is necessary that the semantic explication be broad enough to account for all the kinds of events designated by the wide range of verbs which are compatible with  $S_2$ . This does not mean however that there are no restrictions on the co-occurring predicates whatsoever.<sup>13</sup>

All verbs of intentional action or activity are acceptable provided that they meet the other semantic requirements explicated in the formalization of  $S_2$ . (Thus, pá shān 'climbing a mountain' is excluded as it is not directed towards causing person B to have anything, even though 'climb' is a verb of intentional activity.) Since the number of actions is not part of the meaning of  $S_2$  but rather that some action on A's part is necessary involving an object that A intends B to have, this can be stated simply by the semantic explication in the following way: "Person A does something/because A wants to cause person B to come to have a thing X".

A second reason and the more significant one as to why it is not productive to discuss the gei dative construction  $S_2$  in terms of the number of actions the subject performs, is that  $S_2$  is not a causative construction with respect to successful transferral whereas  $S_1$  is: - In  $S_1$ , we have the component "Person B came to have thing X (because of what person A did)".  $S_2$  does not have

---

13. It should also be noted that Zhu Dexi makes the point that  $V_c$  - the verbs of creation - are an open class, (1979), p.83.

this component, there being no implication that person B finally 'receives' the said object. In  $S_2$ , only the intention of person A to cause person B to have something is encoded. This means that it is too specific to claim that 'giving' is part of the meaning of  $S_2$ . Syntactic evidence can be found as well to back up this statement: gei does not act as a full verb in this construction (that is, it does not mean 'give'), but rather signifies syntactically who the direct object is intended for.<sup>14</sup> As a result, it cannot take any aspectual marking, modal auxiliaries nor be negated (and still be considered part of the one sentence):

Negation of GEI in  $S_2$ :

51. \*Ta jiao yiba yaoshi bu gei wo.  
he hand one:CL key NEG<sub>1</sub> GEI me

Aspectual Marking of GEI:

52. \*Ta jiao yiba yaoshi gei-le wo.  
he hand one:CL key GEI:COM me

Modal Auxiliary + GEI:

53. \*Ta jiao yiba yaoshi neng gei wo.  
he hand one:CL key can GEI me

In contradistinction to this, the main verb in the  $S_2$  construction can be modified by these different syntactic devices, as we would expect. Thus, in examples where the main verb is in the completive aspect such as in Zhang San zuo-le fan gei Mali ("Zhang San cooked a meal for Mary") only the completion of "cooking a meal"

---

14. Note that Teng Shou-hsin (1975: 41) does not differentiate the Benefactive preposition gei nor Goal gei from the ordinary verb gei 'give', contrasting with my analysis of it.

is encoded and whether or not Mary actually 'received' the prepared meal from Zhang San or even ate it, is outside the scope of meaning encoded by  $S_2$ . The latter can only be deduced from the wider context. Similarly, with verbs of giving that occur in  $S_2$ , we cannot presume that person B "came to have" the object in question. In the example Wo ji-le yifeng xin gei ta "I sent a letter to him", only the completion of the action - the sending of the letter - is encoded through the use of the completive aspect marker -le. Even though we have a verb of giving, ji 'send', there is no implication that the other person 'he' received the letter as part of the meaning of  $S_2$ .

Moreover, I think that this causative: non-causative distinction with respect to successful transferral between  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  respectively, holds for the prepositionless and prepositional dative constructions in English as well.

Georgia Green claims in Semantics and Syntactic Regularity (1974: 123, 124, 111) that most of the for-class verbs (1,2,3,5) are not causatives whereas the majority of to-class verbs are in that their semantic paraphrases include "causing the indirect object to have the direct object". She further states that in the for-class verbs, the subject only "intends the indirect object to have the direct object". In brief, Green sees the causative:non-causative dichotomy as pertaining to verbs which form an external dative with to as opposed to verbs which form an external dative with for, for example: "John gave the flowers to me" vs "John bought the flowers for me". In her long chapter on dative-movement verbs, we find many valuable insights into the semantic nature of the constructions they form, including paraphrases for each verb class.

Contrary to her classification of for-class and to-class verbs into non-causatives and causatives, I claim that the causative dichotomy holds between prepositionless datives (with both classes of verbs) on the one hand and prepositional datives with both for and to on the other, for example: "John gave me the flowers" and "John bought me the flowers" vs. "John gave the flowers to me" and "John bought the flowers for me". For the two prepositionless examples, it is part of the meaning that the flowers ended up with me, that is, the action of giving them to me was completed prior to the utterance of these sentences. They can be considered causatives. To the contrary, for the second two examples, the prepositional datives, "I" am merely the intended recipient of the flowers. For the latter, in an everyday context, it would be inferred that I did indeed receive the flowers. However, this is a contextual inference and not an invariant feature of either of the prepositional dative constructions with to or for. I will illustrate this point by creating the following context: Suppose I am busy when John comes to give me the flowers. - My hands are full and I am unable to graciously accept the flowers, so he has to put them on the table. In this context it would only be acceptable to say that "John gave the flowers to me" or "John brought the flowers for me" but not ?"John gave me the flowers". If ownership of the flowers was later disputed because Mary thought John had left them on the table for her, again, it would only be acceptable to say "John gave the flowers to me" (with "me" emphasised) and not \*"John gave me the flowers".

Perhaps clearer exemplification of this causative:non-causative dichotomy can be found with the verb 'send': On going out

to the postbox after the postie has been, I could say 54(a) with regard to a 'long lost' friend but not so easily 54(b):

54. a. May-belle has finally sent me a letter!  
b.?? May-belle has finally sent a letter to me!

The to-dative construction does not imply any effect on the recipient nor does it necessarily contain the meaning that the direct object 'a letter' was intended principally for me to have (and read) but more that the place where I was, was the intended destination of the letter. If the direct object is intended for someone else to have, then only the to-dative is truly acceptable, particularly so if the indirect object (following to) is not animate. Compare the following examples:

55. a. May-belle sent a letter to our place for Jean.  
b. \* May-belle sent our place a letter for Jean.

Similarly, it is the causative nature of the prepositionless form of the to-dative which precludes it from encoding the following meaning where a parcel has been sent but has not yet arrived as opposed to the case for the prepositional form with the external to-phrase:

56. a. \* Viv sent us a parcel yesterday.<sup>15</sup>  
b. Viv sent a parcel to us yesterday.

In relation to bring-class verbs (to-class 1), Green does indeed point out (1974: 118, footnote 1 - her numbering) that "pass

---

15. Sentence (56a) is starred as the corresponding prepositionless form of 56(b). It is also used however as the (substandard) reduced form of "Viv sent a parcel for us".

... implies success if the dative NP is prepositionless, but not if it has a preposition ...

- 1a. \* John passed me the peace pipe, but I wouldn't/didn't take it.
- 1b. John passed the peace pipe to me, but I wouldn't/didn't take it.

She views this particular verb however as an exception to its class.

Similarly, she views the difference between prepositionless and prepositional datives for the radio-class (to-class 4a) as a property of "verbs which do not describe direct and instantaneous transmission of information alone". She provides such examples as the following (1974, p.135, her numbering) which I believe are very revealing of the general causative nature of the prepositionless dative as opposed to the prepositional dative with respect to "coming to have".

- 215a. John wired the news to his mother yesterday, but she can't have received it yet.
- 215b. \* John wired his mother the news yesterday, but she can't have received it yet.

Returning to the dative gei constructions in Chinese,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , and our claim that only  $S_1$  is a causative of having, let us consider an example of each construction with a verb of giving in it:

- 57.  $S_2$  Zuotian Zhang San ji-le yige baoguo gei ta mama,  
Yesterday (name) send:COM one:CL parcel GEI his mother,  
danshi ta hai mei shoudao.  
but she still not receive  
  
Yesterday, Zhang San sent a parcel to his mother, but she still hasn't got it.



58. S<sub>1</sub>: ??Zuotian Zhang San jigei ta mama yige baoguo, danshi  
yesterday (name) send GEI his mother one:CL parcel, but  
ta hai mei shoudao.  
she still not receive

As for the prepositionless datives in English, successfully receiving the object is implied by the causative S<sub>1</sub>, and this is explicated by the component: "Person B came to have thing X". In (58), part of the meaning is therefore, that Zhang San's mother received the parcel he sent to her. As this is subsequently contradicted by the co-ordinate clause, an unacceptable sentence results. The gei dative construction S<sub>2</sub> in (57) however, does not imply that Zhang San's mother received the parcel rather only that the action of sending the parcel was completed. As a result, it is compatible with the following clause. S<sub>2</sub> encodes "causative intention" on the part of the subject as opposed to successful causation where it is understood that the indirect object comes to have something. This causative intention is explicated by the component "Person A wants person B to come to have a thing X" and constitutes an important semantic parameter along which S<sub>1</sub> and S<sub>2</sub> vary.

Green implicitly uses the concept of unity of space to define some of the classes of dative-movement verbs such as the bring-class in the following way (1974:80): "the direct and accompanied physical transfer of an object from an agent to the individual denoted by the indirect object expression". Here I assume that what Green means by "direct and accompanied transfer" is a unity of space for person A and person B when verbs such as bring, take and carry are used to form dative constructions. This construction encodes then that the transferral is effected with the persons denoted by subject and indirect object both being present.

This concept is not applicable to the analysis of these two dative constructions in Chinese however. Examples (57) and (58) show that contiguity in space between person A and person B is not an essential component of meaning whatsoever for either the causative dative construction of transferral  $S_1$  or the non-causative dative of intended benefit construction,  $S_2$ . (Sending a parcel implies that the receiver is elsewhere in the case of both constructions.) Hence, the concept of "unity of space" may be disregarded in our analysis of these two constructions as it is neither a necessary element in the argument for the causativity of  $S_1$  with respect to 'having' nor of use in defining the meaning of either construction.

In the discussion of the two gei dative constructions,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , I have shown that while they share the one semantic feature of causative intention, of the subject wanting to cause the indirect object to come to have some object, they contrast and differ in several other of their semantic features: namely in the presence or absence of the components of causation of having, presupposition of the existence of the direct object, intention to cause a beneficial state of affairs for the indirect object and the usefulness of the direct object to its intended recipient.

First of all, only the  $S_1$  dative of transferral is a causative of 'having' construction due to its encoding that the indirect object does in fact come to receive the object of transferral, this being the essence of the meaning grammaticalized by  $S_1$  - the successful transferral of an object from one person to another. One ramification of such a meaning is that the object of transferral is necessarily presupposed, to be precise, understood to be with the subject prior to the subject's action.

The semantic feature of presupposition of the direct object provides the second point of contrast with the  $S_2$  dative construction of intended benefit: In the latter, the subject's action is carried out with the intention of causing the indirect object to come to have something of use and with this as the prime moving force it is irrelevant whether the subject makes or gets an object to give to "person B" as opposed to simply giving away a possession or something that happens to be in the same place as the subject.

A concomitant feature of the usefulness of the direct object to "person B" is that of the subject intending to cause a beneficial state of affairs for the indirect object (person B) through this action. Neither of these semantic features are present in the semantic structure of the  $S_1$  dative of transferral.

In the final chapter, the benefactive construction formed by gei is examined. This construction explicitly encodes that a beneficial state of affairs arises for the indirect object as a result of the subject's action, and thus may be regarded as causative in this sense, that is, as a causative of benefit.

3 THE BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTION WITH PREVERBAL GEI : S<sub>3</sub>

SUBJECT	-	GEI	-	INDIRECT OBJECT	-	VERB		PHRASE
Wo		gei		ta		ji-le		yifeng xin.
I		GEI		him		send:COM	one:CL	letter
I posted a letter for him.								

As stated above in the introduction, my aim in this chapter is to demonstrate that the gei benefactive construction encodes its own unique meaning and that it is not three-ways ambiguous as advocated by Hermann (1979).

The morpheme gei occurs preverbally in the syntactic structure of S<sub>3</sub> in contrast to S<sub>1</sub> and S<sub>2</sub> where as we have seen it follows the verb. To begin the analysis, let us contrast the meaning of benefactive GEI (S<sub>3</sub>) with that of the dative of transferral, S<sub>1</sub>:

The S<sub>1</sub> counterpart of the above example for S<sub>3</sub> would be:

SUBJECT	-	VERB	-	GEI	-	INDIRECT OBJECT	-	DIRECT OBJECT
Wo		ji		gei		ta		yifeng xin.
I		send		GEI		him		one:CL letter
I sent him a letter.								

Note that the English equivalent of the first S<sub>3</sub> example: "I posted a letter for him" is ambiguous itself without a context: It could be interpreted as either "I posted a letter instead of him posting it" or "I posted him a letter that I intended for him to have". The Chinese example is seemingly ambiguous to the same extent but is only roughly equivalent to either of these

interpretations provided by the English translation as we will see below.

Hermann (1979) as mentioned in the introduction proposes that prepositional (as opposed to verbal) gei has two uses, one as a benefactive and the other as the marker of the goal of the action. Her analysis takes this form: Benefactive gei occurs exclusively preverbally and may be interpreted as either "in place of" or "for the benefit of". Goal gei which typically occurs postverbally is sometimes found to occur preverbally and thus is able to be confused with benefactive gei. Her example to illustrate this last point is one using the verb jieshao 'introduce' (my numbering):

59.           Wo gei ni jieshao yige pengyou.  
          I GEI you introduce one:C1 friend

She claims that this example is polysemous, having the following three possible interpretations (1979: 106):

- (i)       I'll introduce a friend to you.
- (ii)      I'll introduce a friend for you.
- (iii)     I'll introduce a friend instead of you.

However, this kind of evidence cannot be used to argue convincingly for a polysemous preverbal gei construction as these three interpretations are inferential possibilities determined by the context, not by the semantic structure of  $S_3$ . I argue in favour of this viewpoint below.

Hermann is not alone in advocating this position.<sup>16</sup> There are other linguists who have also pointed out that preverbal gei can mean either "on behalf of", "instead of" or "to" depending on the context, such as Lü Shu-xiang (1980: 196), Y.C. Li (1971: 24), Zhu De-xi (1979: 83) and Shou-hsin Teng (1975: 151). Li and Thompson (1981: 386) slightly differ in their particular analytic standpoint: Although they characterize the dichotomy of gei constructions in a similar way to Teng and Hermann as one of gei marking a benefactive noun phrase preverbally as opposed to marking a noun phrase with the indirect object postverbally, they regard the problem of ambiguity with the preverbal benefactive construction as historical, arising from the comparatively recent introduction of gei to mark the indirect object preverbally in modern Mandarin (1981: 386-7, their numbering and translation of example):

This is a manifestation of the general structural change which is pushing the language toward the verb final type ... for more than a millenium. ... The appearance of the indirect object in the preverbal position, however, is confined to only a few verbs, such as xiě 'write', liú 'keep, save', dǎ (diànhuà) 'telephone' ...

- 
16. Hermann's analysis is in fact based on that of Teng Shou-hsin (1975). Also note that preverbal gei is used to form a passive construction, described in the introduction and below. S<sub>3</sub> may only be regarded as polysemous or more accurately 'ambiguous' in this sense and not in the way Hermann intends. However, the adversative gei passive has entirely different semantic requirements to that of the benefactive gei construction even though their syntax is superficially identical.

They exemplify this ambiguity with the following sentence:

- (47) wo gei ta xie le yi feng xin  
I to 3 sg write PFV one CL letter  
for  
I wrote a letter to him/her.  
for

Contrary to these two kinds of analyses, I will propose that we need only one semantic representation for the preverbal gei construction ( $S_3$ ) to account for these two or three possibilities of interpretation at "surface level" that holds however within a purely synchronic framework.

First of all, to successfully account for this seeming polysemy, the "lowest common denominator" of meaning for the three possible interpretations needs to be factored out. I consider and will try to justify that this is one of the subject wanting to cause a beneficial state of affairs to come about for the indirect object and consequently that the maximum three interpretations of any given example of an  $S_3$  construction are contextual inferences and not due to the existence of three semantically different but syntactically identical constructions. After showing how a unified semantic treatment can be given for this construction, the task of decomposing these complex descriptive terms into more elemental units for use in the semantic representation will be tackled:

Li and Thompson's example (47) could also have the specific interpretation of "I wrote a letter instead of him/her" depending on the context, as well as those they give of "I wrote a letter for him/her" and "I wrote a letter to him/her". Let us think of three suitable contexts that reveal the semantic feature of "benefit" which I claim underlies all these interpretations and is

conspicuously missing from the English and Chinese paraphrases pointed out so far: I might write a letter instead of my friend because she is unable to do it herself (she has a broken hand/is illiterate or is simply too busy and I want to save her time) or then again, I might write a letter to my friend as I know she would like to receive a letter from me and hear the latest news. Thirdly, I could write a letter for my friend (to someone else) to help her find a job. The problem to date is that superficially observed, it would seem that the first two meanings of these three separate interpretations of the above example could presumably be encoded by a ti construction ('instead of') in Chinese (discussed below) and the S<sub>2</sub> dative construction of intended benefit with postverbal gei. Similarly, the third meaning could be encoded by a wei construction ('in the interest of') which will also be discussed below. The semantic feature missing in these three different constructions but uniting the three possible interpretations of the S<sub>3</sub> example is that in each a beneficial state of affairs is caused for the friend in question, denoted by the indirect object that is marked by gei. - This is the particular component of meaning especially singled out for encoding by the S<sub>3</sub> construction and clearly distinguishing the latter from the other two gei constructions. (Note that the dative S<sub>2</sub> construction encodes an action of intended benefit to the I.O.)

The English translations of the given Chinese examples of the benefactive construction S<sub>3</sub> may be considered then to describe specific instances of how a situation of "benefit" is created for another person, while omitting at the same time to paraphrase the feature of benefit.



The presentation of the semantic structure of the benefactive construction with preverbal gei S<sub>3</sub>, precedes a discussion which contrasts the semantic features of the S<sub>3</sub> construction with the semantically related ti and wei constructions in Chinese and ends with a discussion contrasting S<sub>3</sub> with the other two gei constructions: S<sub>1</sub> and S<sub>2</sub>.

S<sub>3</sub>: THE BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTION WITH PREVERBAL GEI

SUBJECT - GEI - INDIRECT - VERB PHRASE  
OBJECT

Wo	<u>gei</u>	ta	<u>ji-le</u>	<u>yifeng xin.</u>
I	GEI	him	send:COM	one:CL letter

I posted a letter for him.

Person A                      Person B

Something happened to person B  
that person A wanted  
because A did something  
I'm thinking of it as of something good for B

3.1 COMPARISON OF THE BENEFACTIVE GEI CONSTRUCTION WITH THE TI AND WEI CONSTRUCTIONS

The benefactive gei construction exists side-by-side with two other semantically related constructions using the prepositions ti - 'on behalf of' or 'instead of' and wei - 'for the sake of'. In the latter two constructions, ti and wei occur in prepositional phrases preceding the verb phrase in the same way as gei does in benefactive S<sub>3</sub>.

Let us discuss the use of ti first of all: The construction with ti encodes proxy action; that is, action carried

out on behalf of another.<sup>17</sup> It remains neutral with respect to benefit for the indirect object:

TI:

SUBJECT - TI - INDIRECT - VERB PHRASE  
OBJECT

Wo ti Zhang San mai huoche piao.

I instead of (name) buy train ticket

I bought a train ticket on behalf of Zhang San.

whereas the construction with wei encodes that the subject's action is symbolic of the way the latter feels toward the person denoted by the indirect object:

WEI:

SUBJECT - WEI - INDIRECT - VERB PHRASE  
OBJECT

Zhang San wei Mali pa le yizuo shan.

(name) for:the:sake:of (name) climb COM one:CL mountain

Zhang San climbed a mountain for Mary's sake.

In standard Chinese, ti is restricted to the meaning of carrying out an action in place of someone else,<sup>18</sup> that is, substituting for another person, although not necessarily because the latter wants it. This obviously reflects and is related to its main verb usage 'substitute for' or 'take the place of':

---

17 Only ti combined with action predicates comes under discussion here. It may also co-occur with some stative predicates e.g. Wo ti ni gaoxing "I'm happy on your behalf".

18 Chao (1968: 332) makes this point as well for Northern Mandarin as opposed to the Central dialects where ti is also used in the sense of Benefactive gei. I found that my two main informants, one from Beijing and the other from Harbin, used ti exclusively for 'instead of' as is typical of northern speakers. I will consider this to be standard usage.

Verbal use of ti:

60. Ni xie huir, wo lai ti ni.

you rest while I come TI you

You rest for a while and I'll take your place.

Wei in its prepositional use of 'for the sake of' has a more literary flavour as does its English counterpart and is consequently not a common feature of colloquial speech.<sup>19</sup> As a verb, it is typically used as the second verb in a serial verb construction with several usages, two of them being verbs which mean 'become' and 'act as'. The verbal usage is mainly restricted to the written language as well (c.f. Lü Shuxiang 1981: 483).

61. Xuan ta wei zhuxi.

select her act chairperson

Elect her as the chairperson.

Let us first compare the semantic structures of ti and wei with that of the gei benefactive,  $S_3$ :<sup>20</sup> In this discussion, the aim is to show that the benefactive construction with preverbal gei ( $S_3$ ) encodes not only that the subject intends to create a beneficial state of affairs for the indirect object but also that the subject causes this to come about.

In contrast to this, the construction with wei will be shown to single out only the feature of imagining that the subject's symbolic action could cause a beneficial state of affairs amongst

---

19 Li and Thompson (1981: 385) also note that wei is "the more archaic form" of the two prepositional constructions with gei and wei.

20 Here "ti" and "wei" are used as abbreviations for "the construction with TI" and the "construction with WEI" respectively.

others for encoding in its semantic structure while the construction with ti 'chooses' an entirely different set of semantic features.

At first glance, it would seem that simple intransitive verbs may not be used in  $S_3$ :

62.            \*Zhang San gei Mali pao-bu qu.  
              (name)     GEI (name) run/go  
  
              (Zhang San ran/went for Mary's sake.)

However, this is not a syntactically defined restriction as we find that while simple intransitive verbs are excluded, as part of a more complex verb phrase they are acceptable, provided that they conform to the semantic requirements of  $S_3$  outlined above:

63.            Zhang San gei Mali pao dao tushuguan qu.  
              (name)     GEI (name) run to library go  
  
              Zhang San ran to the library for Mary.

64.            Zhang San gei Mali qu mai cai.  
              (name)     GEI (name) go buy vegetable  
  
              Zhang San went to buy vegetables for Mary.

In the benefactive construction, the purpose of the action has to be clear in each example in order to be able to construe what kind of benefit will be gained from it. With sentence (62) "He ran for Mary's sake", no clear inference can be made at all with respect to this semantic parameter.

On the other hand, in (63) "Zhang San ran to the library for Mary" it can easily be inferred that Mary benefitted as a result of this event: her books were returned or new ones borrowed. In contrast to the case for gei, it is perfectly acceptable however to

use wei with intransitive verbs such as "run", "eat", "drink" and "go", when used as atelic activity verbs:

65. Zhang San wei Mali pao-bu/(qu).

(name) WEI (name) run/go

Zhang San ran/(went) for Mary's sake.

66. Zhang San wei (\*gei) Mali chi fan/(he jiu)/(xie zi).

(name) WEI (\*GEI) (name) eat/ (drink)/ (write)

Zhang San ate/(drank)/(wrote) for Mary's sake.

In all these examples, Zhang San carries out an action or activity that he might not normally have undertaken, but does so to show how he feels towards Mary. - His action in each case is symbolic of the benevolent feelings he holds in regard to Mary. In (65), for example, we could think of a context where Zhang San who usually does not like taking part in competitive sports is motivated by his feelings of love and devotion towards Mary to enter in a race and run "for her sake". Mary, of course, could be totally oblivious of these feelings, yet the subject, Zhang San, carries out this activity with the thought that it somehow could benefit her as well. - He imagines this to be the case.

This brings us to the question that if "benefit" is involved in the meaning of the wei construction, then why is it that the benefactive gei construction ( $S_3$ ) cannot co-occur with these intransitive activity verbs? The reason for the exclusion of these verbs from  $S_3$  is clearly that it is difficult to interpret what effect the subject's action could have on the indirect object, beneficial or otherwise. The gei benefactive,  $S_3$ , is causative insofar as it encodes the successful causation of a beneficial state of affairs for the indirect object whereas the wei construction

encodes rather the subject imagining that they could cause a beneficial state of affairs for the indirect object by means of an action symbolic of their feelings of good will. This is apparent in another context for example (65) where Mary is in fact no longer alive but Zhang San knowing that Mary had always wanted him to be an athletics star, runs in races out of his enduring love for her. This context would be risible if not ridiculous for the closest benefactive gei example we can find of Zhang San gei Mali pao-dao tushuguan qu "Zhang San ran to the library for Mary". For any beneficial effect on Mary to be interpreted, "Mary" must of course be understood to be a living person. Not so for the symbolic wei construction, where neither causative intention nor causation of a beneficial state of affairs per se is encoded.

Similarly, in example (66), we could imagine a context where Zhang San is growing thinner and thinner day-by-day until it is only the thought of Mary worrying about his state of ill-health and his feelings of devotion towards her or wanting to please her that cause him to start eating properly again, not because he wants to do himself a "good turn". Again, the fact that it is difficult to interpret what kind of beneficial effect this could have on Mary means that no benefactive gei counterpart can be found.

The ti construction freely occurs with these intransitive activity verbs too, encoding that the subject carries out the action on behalf of the indirect object:

67. Zhang San ti Mali qu/(chi fan)/(he jiu)/(xie zi).  
(name) TI (name) go/ (eat) /(drink) / (write)

Zhang San went (ate)/(drank)/(wrote) on Mary's behalf.

The context appropriate for the use of the ti construction is one where Mary is obliged to do something but is unable to or does not want to, which causes the subject to undertake the task of fulfilling this obligation. For example, Mary is socially obliged to drink wine for a toast at a dinner party but as she is a teetotaler, Zhang San fulfills this obligation by drinking her glass of wine on her behalf so that she toasts "by proxy".

Further proof that the verb class permissible in benefactive gei S<sub>3</sub> is not syntactically definable is that if we merely exclude intransitive activity verbs, we cannot account for the unacceptability of the following example:

68.        Zhang San (\*gei) wei/(ti) Mali chi-le dianxin.  
            (name)    (\*GEI) WEI/(TI) (name) eat:COM dessert

Zhang San ate dessert for Mary's sake/(on Mary's behalf).

The English for-dative "Zhang San ate dessert for Mary" may only be translated into Chinese by wei (with the implication that it was for Mary's sake) or by ti (on Mary's behalf) but not by gei, even though the activity verb chi 'eat' is furnished with a direct object dianxin 'dessert' in this case.

Here, ti could be used in a context where Mary is on a slimming diet but does not wish to offend her hosts by not eating dessert so she asks Zhang San to eat it for her despite the fact that Zhang San has already eaten one portion of dessert and may not particularly feel like eating a second one. Gei is excluded as the eating of Mary's dessert by Zhang San cannot be understood to directly affect Mary in terms of creating tangible benefit for her. On the other hand the use of wei conjures up a context where Zhang San breaks his longstanding rule of never eating sugary food because

of his feelings towards Mary, apparently stronger than this prior resolve. In this context, we assume that Mary made the dessert and thus Zhang San would like to please her by eating and appreciating her cooking.

We find that there is no simple classification of verbs occurring in or prohibited from  $S_3$ , identical to the situation outlined for  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ . It should be noted, however, that verbs of transferral (or giving) are highly restricted in their occurrence in  $S_3$ . When they occur in  $S_3$ , they must be interpreted as meaning the transferring of an object to someone other than the indirect object, if they can be interpreted at all.

69. ?Ta gei wo mai fangzi.

he GEI me sell house

He sold a house for me.

70. \*Ta gei wo song ben shu.

he GEI me present CL book

(He gave a book as a present [to someone else] for me.)

In some analyses, in particular Zhu (1979), only verbs of giving which can be interpreted as transferral of the direct object to the person designated by the indirect object in  $S_3$  (rather than to someone else not explicitly encoded in the construction) are considered acceptable.<sup>20</sup> This small set of verbs co-incides to a large extent with those listed in Li and Thompson (1981) as being

---

20. Zhu De-xi, (1979), pp.83-5: Zhu claims further that gei in these three constructions ( $S_1$ ,  $S_2$  and  $S_3$ ) is a verb (p.81) without substantiating this claim with any evidence. In his analysis of  $S_3$ , he also claims that verbs of giving  $V_a$  mainly do not occur in it or that when they do, gei changes from being a verb to a preposition with the sense of the



verbs for which a preverbal GEI + Noun Phrase is now commonly interpreted as "to + indirect object" rather than as gei marking a benefactive noun phrase (see quote above). These are verbs such as liú 'keep', xiě 'write', dài 'carry' and dǎ diànhuà 'telephone'. Although Zhu does not put forward the kind of diachronic explanation that Li and Thompson use to explain this confusing set of data on verbs of giving, he certainly does claim that the verbs of giving are excluded from  $S_3$  as they can only be interpreted in this construction, as "serving" as he phrases it, (the subject doing something instead of the indirect object doing it) and no longer as "giving". These are the verbs such as sòng 'give as a present', mai 'sell', péi 'compensate' and cì 'bestow':

71.           \*Gei ta shang-le yiliang yinzi.  
              GEI him reward:COM one:ounce silver  
  
              (?Reward [someone else] with an ounce of silver for him.)
72.           \*Gei ta jiao-le yidian benshi.  
              GEI him teach:COM one:bit skill  
  
              (?Teach [someone else] some skills for him.)

- 
20.   [cont'd]  
      construction changing from one encoding "giving" to one encoding "serving". Here he means that  $S_3$  with verbs of giving is similar to the ti construction in encoding that the subject does something instead of the indirect object doing it. Zhu stars examples (69) and (70) above in his analysis and states that only the verb of giving jì 'send' and other verbs such as jiān 'select (with chopsticks)', liú 'keep', xiě 'write' dǎ (diànhuà), 'telephone', huì 'transmit' and dài 'carry' are permissible in  $S_3$  with the verb gei as opposed to preposition gei.

73. \*Gei ta jie-le wukuai qian.

GEI him lend:COM five:dollar money

(?Lend \$5 [to someone else] for him.) (N.B. This does have a possible interpretation as "Borrow \$5 for him." when jie, which has two meanings - either "lend" or "borrow" in English - is interpreted as a verb of getting and not of giving.)<sup>21</sup>

I believe that the reason for such verbs of giving being excluded apart from the small set of exceptions listed above is again not due to their interpretation in the construction as events of the subject "serving" the indirect object (doing something instead of the indirect object doing it) as Zhu suggests but rather due to the impossibility of interpreting how a beneficial state of affairs comes about for the subject. In the situation of money being lent to someone else for me, presumably my own money, I do not stand to benefit from such a philanthropic action, at least in a tangible as opposed to spiritual way.

The second reason why Zhu's interpretation of the subject "serving" the indirect object for verbs of giving in  $S_3$  does not account for their exclusion is the possibility of making this specific contextual inference for other acceptable  $S_3$  examples with verb classes such as verbs of getting like mai "buy":

74. Wo gei ta mai yiliang che.

I GEI him buy one:CL car

I bought a car for him.

Zhu points out that this example could have the following two interpretations:

---

21. Examples from Zhu, (1979), p.85, my translation and numbering.

- a. I bought a car to give him.
- b. I bought a car in his place (instead of him buying it).<sup>22</sup>

Zhu continues his analysis of benefactive gei S<sub>3</sub> with the following remark about the category of verbs of getting (1979: 84):

Genuine S<sub>3</sub> expresses giving. However, this category seems to contain the meaning of serving. Nevertheless, this isn't sufficient to prove that the gei in it is a preposition ... The meaning of serving seems to be derived from the meaning of giving (giving itself can be considered as a kind of serving) and is certainly not bestowed upon it by the preposition gei.

If it is possible to interpret other verb classes in S<sub>3</sub> separate from verbs of giving or transferral such as the verbs of getting as designating events where the subject does something instead of the indirect object doing it, (that is, where the subject "serves" the indirect object) then this reason definitely can't be used as the explanation for verbs of giving being excluded from S<sub>3</sub>, Zhu's viewpoint.

It was pointed out in the beginning of this section that one of the specific interpretations of S<sub>3</sub> could be that of "proxy action". Here it was also argued that the various interpretations of S<sub>3</sub> should be considered as contextual inferences of the meaning of "benefit" encoded in S<sub>3</sub> and not as proof of the polysemy of preverbal GEI. In the example "Zhang San bought a car for Mary", whether or not Zhang San buys the car on Mary's behalf because she

---

22 Zhu, (1979: 84). Note that Zhu divides S<sub>3</sub> into two categories: those with verbal and those with prepositional gei. The (b) interpretation is only available for prepositional gei which means "serving" or "instead of" as pointed out above and not for verbal gei. (Zhu claims that otherwise gei acts a verb in all these constructions.)

is too busy or 'for Mary' simply because he wants to give her a car as a present, both such contextual inferences of  $S_3$  share the feature of the causation of a beneficial state of affairs for Mary by means of the subject's action.

The acceptability of  $S_3$  examples is thus determined by the presence or absence of this component stating the effect of the subject's action on the indirect object. It has already been shown that English examples "He went for her" or "He ate dessert for her" cannot be translated by the benefactive gei construction but only by wei or ti precisely for this reason. Similarly, with the verb jiè which can mean either 'borrow' or 'lend' depending on the context, only the 'borrow' interpretation is possible in  $S_3$ :

75.            Ta gei wo jie      yiqian              kuai qian.  
              he GEI me borrow one:thousand CL    money  
  
              He borrowed \$1,000 for me. (\*"He lent \$1,000 [to someone else] for me.)

When jiè is understood as 'borrow' it can be simultaneously interpreted that the money was borrowed from someone else to give to me, that is, the money was intended for me to have and benefit from. In the case of lending, however, it is not possible to make the same interpretation (that the money was intended for me to have) and in this situation only the  $S_1$  gei construction can be used to encode lending, this being an event of transferral of money to the person denoted by the indirect object:

76.  $S_1$ :    Ta jie    gei wo yiqian              kuai qian.  
              he lend GEI me one:thousand CL    money  
  
              He lent me \$1,000.

It is also clear that for events where the subject's action can be understood to cause benefit for the indirect object, the  $S_3$  construction may only be used when the event directly affects the "indirect object", that is, where the "beneficiary" of the event is involved in the event itself and not one of the beneficiary's possessions. The following example does not satisfy these semantic requirements and may only be encoded by a ti or wei construction:

77. Ta (\*gei)/wei/(ti) wo mai sizai wo jia qianmian de xiao niao.  
he (\*GEI)/WEI/(TI) me bury die:at my house front REL little bird  
He buried the little bird which died in front of my house (\*for me) for my sake/(on my behalf).

In (77), even though the event involves one of my "possessions", the "territory" surrounding the place where I live and the subject's action may be thought of as benefitting me, only the wei and ti constructions may be used to encode it as the event does not directly involve me.

Indirect or "vicarious" benefit is also excluded from the benefactive. If the event involves a friend or relative of the person designated by the indirect object, again only ti or wei may be used when the event encodes the relative or friend benefitting rather than the indirect object:

78. Zhang San (\*gei) wei/(ti) Mali ding cai gei ta de haizi  
(name) (\*GEI) WEI/(TI) (name) order meal GEI she GEN child  
Zhang San ordered a meal for Mary's child (\*for Mary) for Mary's sake/(on Mary's behalf).

Of course if the meal is intended for Mary to eat, then the benefactive is completely acceptable:



beneficial one, specifically one that the speaker is thinking of as a good state of affairs for the indirect object and one that the subject wants to cause for the indirect object.

80.           ?Zhang San gei Mali   chao-hu-le   cai.  
              (name)    GEI (name) fry:burn:COM meal

Zhang San burnt the meal he was cooking for Mary.

This sentence is not acceptable unless Zhang San's burning of the food is interpreted as accidental and that despite this, he had really intended to do Mary a "good turn" by cooking for her. We can regard this as a misfire of the subject's good intentions, and as such it does not violate any constraints in the semantic representation.

The beneficial or desirable nature of the state of affairs which comes about for the indirect object is encoded in the semantic structure as the speaker's viewpoint. Consequently, even in the case of a sadistic Zhang San who believes that his masochistic friend Mary likes being punched or verbally abused and thus to carry out these actions would cause a beneficial state of affairs to arise for her, such events cannot be encoded in the benefactive gei construction. It is a striking semantic phenomenon which results in sentences with the same syntactic form as the benefactive gei construction being interpreted as adversative passives formed by gei:<sup>24</sup>

---

24 Similarly, Bennett (1981: 70) makes the following remark with respect to Chao's claim (1948: 193) that gei can mark both the object and the agent (his example and translation):

13. Zhangsan gei Lisi da le.

'name'   GEI 'name' hit 'aspect': Zhangsan hit Lisi OR  
Zhangsan was hit by Lisi.

(cont.)

81.        Zhang San gei Mali     da -le yiquan.  
          (name)     GEI (name) hit:COM one:fist
- a.        Zhang San was punched by Mary.
- b.        \* Zhang San punched Mary (for Mary's benefit).
- 
82.        Ta gei Mali     ma -le     yidun.  
          he GEI (name) abuse:COM one:CL
- a.        He was (verbally) abused by Mary.
- b.        \* He (verbally) abused Mary (for Mary's benefit).

Thus events considered undesirable in nature by the speaker are unconditionally excluded from occurring in the benefactive gei construction. The semantic representation for the benefactive gei construction,  $S_3$ , is restated below so that it may be conveniently compared with those for ti and wei on the following pages:

SUBJECT	-	GEI	-	INDIRECT	-	VERB PHRASE
				OBJECT		
Zhang San		gei		Mali		da-le yijian maoyi.
(name)		GEI		Mary		knit:COM one:CL jumper
Zhang San knitted a jumper for Mary.						
Person A				Person B		

Something happened to person B that person A wanted because person A did something I'm thinking of it as of something good for person B.

---

24        (contd.)  
          "However, informants I asked about this sentence only get the 'Zhangsan was hit by Lisi' reading: for them, gei can only mark the agent, not the object."



3.1.1 The Ti Construction of Social Obligation

In the construction with ti, we find in contrast to the benefactive gei construction, that intention on the part of the subject to cause a beneficial state of affairs for the indirect object is once more not a semantic feature. Ti encodes rather that the subject carries out some action in place of person B due to (i) the fact that person B couldn't carry out this action at that particular time which they were obliged to undertake and (ii) person A's (the subject's) desire to fulfill this obligation, for example, out of a sense of duty: The assumption behind the use of the ti construction is that the subject is normally able to carry out the action required of him or her but at that particular time cannot do so for some (unmentioned) reason. This explains why (iv) below is unacceptable. Restricting the ti construction to examples encoding actions (and not ones encoding events such as emotions) in order that it may be compared with the benefactive gei construction, I propose the following semantic representation:

	SUBJECT	-	<u>TI</u>	-	INDIRECT	-	VERB PHRASE	
					OBJECT			
	Person A				Person B			
(i)	<u>Zhang San</u>		<u>ti</u>		<u>Mali</u>		<u>qu.</u>	(S <sub>3</sub> :*GEI)
	(name)		TI		(name)		go	
	Zhang San went on Mary's behalf.							
(ii)	<u>Zhang San</u>		<u>ti</u>		<u>Li Si</u>		<u>gua lian.</u>	(S <sub>3</sub> :*GEI)
	(name)		TI		(name)		shave	
	Zhang San did the shaving (of the customer) on Lisi's behalf (instead of Li Si having to do it). (e.g. where Zhang San and Li Si are both barbers)							

(iii) Zhang San ti Mali song-le yiben shu. (S<sub>3</sub>:\*GEI)

(name) TI (name) present:COM one:CL book

Zhang San gave a present of a book (to someone else) on Mary's behalf.

(iv) Laoshi gei (\*ti) xuesheng jieshi.

teacher GEI (\*TI) student explain

The teacher explained (something) for the students' benefit (\*instead of the students). (We assume the students were not capable of explaining this and thus the use of ti is precluded.)

Assuming that person B has to do something (Z) at a certain time

and that Z is something which B is capable of doing I say:

Person A did something (Z) that person B should've done because person A knew that person B couldn't do Z at this time

Z was something that A felt should be done.

### 3.1.2 The Symbolic Wei Construction

Comparing the wei construction to the benefactive gei construction, it is apparent that the indirect object, person B, is not affected in any way as a result of A's action: This feature may be clearly detected by comparing the following pair of examples:

83. Wo wei ni qu. c.f. \*Wo gei ni qu.

I WEI you go I GEI you go

I'll go for your sake.

Green defines the indirect object in the English benefactive construction (her for-class 5) as "the intended recipient of a symbolic action" (1974: 96). Indeed, as the discussion above showed, the wei construction in Chinese is perfectly suited in its semantic structure to encoding "symbolic action", that is, acts which are symbolic of the subject's feelings

of good will towards the indirect object. Several of Green's English examples are translated by the wei construction below (1974: 95-6, my numbering):<sup>25</sup>

84.        Tamen yao wei Ligen sha yige xipi.  
          they want WEI Reagan kill one:CL hippy  
          They're going to kill a hippy for Reagan's sake.
85.        Sam wei ta de duixiang pa-le yizuo shan.  
          (name) WEI his girlfriend climb:COM one:CL mountain  
          Sam climbed a mountain for his girlfriend's sake.
86.        Wei wo sha yitiao long.  
          WEI me kill one:CL dragon  
          Kill a dragon for my sake.

Green remarks that the term "benefactive" is really a misnomer for the English construction in question and that (1974: 96)

These constructions may refer to acts which certainly don't benefit the person they are intended to impress, although they are of course, performed 'for his benefit' in the sense that he is the intended audience.

Green claims further (1974: 95) that for internal indirect objects to be acceptable in the benefactive construction, "the act denoted by the symbolic construction must be one in which a change of state regarding the direct object noun phrase is effected" and uses examples such as (80b) and (80d) to justify this claim:

- 80b.        Sam promised to crush his lover a mountain.  
80d.        \*Sam promised to taste his lover her wine.

---

25        Green defines the benefactive here as those "expressions which can be used to denote acts intended to be symbolic of the subject's devotion to the indirect object..." N.B. The English examples from Green have been slightly adjusted to fit the meaning of the wei construction better.

[Note that Green does not distinguish between prepositionless and prepositional forms of the benefactive construction here (that is, between [80b] and "Sam promised to crush a mountain for his lover") but rather discusses them together.<sup>26</sup>]

The latter observation regarding a change of state which affects the (internal) indirect object of the English 'benefactive' construction bears some relevance to the discussion of the Chinese benefactive gei construction as opposed to the symbolic wei construction. Both encode "benefit" in different ways: gei encodes it in the sense of the subject wanting to cause a beneficial state of affairs to come about for the indirect object whereas wei encodes the subject imagining that their action might cause this.

Only the gei construction however, encodes the causation of this state of affairs in addition to the intention to cause it. [These points have already been illustrated with examples above.] This causation of a beneficial state of affairs is moreover interpreted by means of the direct effect of the given event on the indirect object, the NP introduced by gei. Thus, I claim this to be the major semantic distinction holding between the benefactive gei construction and the "symbolic" wei construction: This contrast in grammaticalised meaning is clear in minimal pairs such as that in (87):

87. a. Ta wei zuguo er si.      b. \*Ta gei zuguo er si  
he WEI fatherland so die      he GEI fatherland so die  
He died for the sake of his country.

---

26 Here I would like to note that Green's examples of the "internal" benefactive given here are unacceptable sentences for me. I can only say "Sam promised to crush a mountain for his lover" with the external prepositional phrase.

The reason why benefactive gei cannot be used in the case of (87) as opposed to symbolic wei is that there is no direct effect on the indirect object as a result of the subject's action. In other words, a beneficial state of affairs for the indirect object of the gei construction can only be interpreted following on from the interpretation of the latter being affected in some way by the subject's action.

The event of a soldier dying in battle "for the sake of his country" cannot be considered beneficial (considered as an isolated event) for the "fatherland". It does after all represent the loss of another able-bodied soldier. Only the fact of fighting for one's country can at best be viewed as doing something creditable, or meritorious, depending upon the speaker's viewpoint, but nonetheless never as causing a good state of affairs to come about. Thus, the wei construction does not encode the causing of a beneficial state of affairs as part of its meaning but instead encodes that the subject through his action wants to show what he feels towards the indirect object. Moreover these feelings are desirable in nature. Consider the following examples which illustrate this point:

88. a. Wei renmin fuwu!  
WEI people serve  
Serve the people! (i.e. "for the sake of the people")
- b. Wei renminbi fuwu!  
WEI people:currency serve  
Serve for the sake of the people's currency!

The first sentence is a political slogan that used to be commonly seen in China painted on large red billboards.

The second example in (88) could be used as a cynical comment on the higher pricing of, for example, goods in foreigners' hotels and shops in China, expressing that it is one's good feelings towards money that causes one to serve others rather than one's good feelings towards "the people" as in (a).

However, as also pointed out before, although the wei construction does not encode causation of a beneficial state of affairs for the indirect object, it does contain the component of imagined benefit to the effect "Person A imagines that this could cause something good to happen to B". This is evident in the acceptability of 89(a) as opposed to 89(b), unless again it is interpreted ironically:

89. a. Zhengfu wei renmin fuwu.<sup>27</sup>  
government WEI people serve

The government serves for the sake of the people.

b. \*Zhengfu wei renmin xinghui.  
government WEI people bribe

(The government carries out bribery for the sake of the people.)

Hence, the wei construction not only encodes an action symbolic of the 'benevolent' feelings the subject holds towards the indirect object but also the subject's imagining that their action could cause a beneficial state of affairs to arise for the indirect object. It is not part of the meaning however that this state of affairs does come about. As we have seen, in examples such as Ta

---

27 There seems to be a corresponding gei sentence (of a less grandiose nature): Ta gei wo fuwu: "He's serving me" used for example in a shop. However, here fuwu acts as a noun meaning "service" and gei as the verb 'give'.

wei zuguo er si "He died for his country's sake", the imagined benefit does not ever extend beyond the subject's conception of his act, as the indirect object "country" cannot be understood to be affected in any direct way by the event of the soldier's death.

Due to the symbolic nature of the subject's action, the wei construction tends to have events of a more grandiose nature occurring in it, such as someone travelling all the way to the Antarctic to symbolize his feelings for another person, Mary:

90. Ta wei Mali qu-le nanji (\*S<sub>3</sub>:GEI)

he WEI (name) go:COM Antarctic

He went to the Antarctic for Mary's sake.

Bearing all these features in mind, the semantic representation for the symbolic wei construction is proposed as follows:

SUBJECT - WEI - INDIRECT - VERB PHRASE  
OBJECT

Ta wei Li Si pa-le yizuo shan.  
she WEI (name) climb:COM one:CL mountain

She climbed a mountain for Li Si's sake.

Person A Person B

Person A did something (Z)  
because A wanted to show person B  
that she felt good feelings towards B  
A imagined that something good could happen to B  
because of this (Z)

### 3.2 COMPARISON OF THE THREE GEI CONSTRUCTIONS

We end this discussion of the benefactive construction in Chinese by comparing it with the two dative constructions formed by gei,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ . An example of each construction is first presented for the reader's convenience:<sup>28</sup>

$S_1$ : Dative of Transferral with Enclitic GEI:

Wo ji-gei ta yifeng xin.

I sent him one:CL letter

I sent him a letter.

$S_2$ : Dative of Intended Benefit with Postverbal GEI:

Wo ji-le yifeng xin gei ta.

I send:COM one:CL letter GEI him

I sent a letter to him.

$S_3$ : Benefactive Construction with Preverbal GEI:

We gei ta ji-le yifeng xin.

I GEI him send:COM one:CL letter

I sent (posted) a letter for him.

#### 3.2.1 The Components for Presupposition of a Direct Object Compared

As we have seen, the benefactive construction ( $S_3$ ) does not encode transferral of an object and this is reflected syntactically by the fact that a direct object is not required. (cf. Zhang San gei Mali pao dao tushuguan qu: "Zhang San ran to the library for Mary"). The semantic consequence of this is that neither is a concrete object required by  $S_3$  whereas it is for both

---

28. A summary of constructions may be found at the end of this chapter with the semantic formula for each construction restated.



the dative constructions,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ . Nor is any direct object presupposed as in the dative  $S_1$  construction.

Given these major semantic distinctions between the three constructions formed by gei, no simple grammatical transformation from one construction into the other exists. If we try to transform an example of  $S_3$  containing a verb of creation - zuofan 'cook a meal':

91.  $S_3$ : Zhang San gei Mali zuo fan.  
(name) GEI (name) cook meal  
Zhang San cooked a meal for Mary

into the syntactic configuration for  $S_1$ , only an ungrammatical sentence results:

92.  $S_1$ : \*Zhang San zuo -gei Mali fan.  
(name) make:GEI (name) meal

On the other hand, in the  $S_2$  construction of intended benefit with postverbal gei where there is no presupposition of any object in the semantic structure, this being also the case for  $S_3$ , the benefactive gei construction, verbs of creation are permissible, provided that the action depicted produces an object which can be then given to the indirect object:

93.  $S_2$ : Zhang San zuo-le fan gei Mali.  
(name) make:COM meal GEI (name)  
Zhang San cooked a meal for Mary.

If the subject's action is not intended to cause the indirect object to come to have something, then both the  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  dative constructions are proscribed, whereas the benefactive



3.2.2 The Components for Causativity versus Causative Intention  
with respect to Causation of Having and Causation of  
Benefit Compared

The benefactive gei construction ( $S_3$ ) is non-causative as is the  $S_2$  dative construction with respect to the parameter of causing another person to come to have something as opposed to the causative  $S_1$  dative construction. The gei benefactive  $S_3$  is however a causative of benefit as opposed to the case for dative  $S_2$  where only intended benefit is encoded and to the complete lack of either of these features in dative  $S_1$ , the dative of transferral.

As noted in Chapter I, the dative of transferral with enclitic gei,  $S_1$ , has successful accomplishment of the transferral invariably encoded, due to the perfectivizing nature of gei used as a verb complement. Other aspectual marking, such as the completive aspect marker -le is thus not required for this semantic function and may not intervene between the verb and gei. This was used as one piece of syntactic evidence to argue for  $S_1$  as a causative of having.

Contrasting to this, the dative  $S_2$  construction and the benefactive  $S_3$  construction may freely take aspectual marking on the main verb, exemplified by (96) where co-occurrence of the three constructions with the completive aspect marker -le is compared.

96.  $S_1$ : The Dative of Transferral

\*Wo dai-le-gei ni yihe tang.

I bring:COM:GEI you one:CL candy

S<sub>2</sub>: The Dative of Intended Benefit

Wo dai-le yihe tang gei ni

I bring:COM one:CL candy GEI you

I've brought a box of candy [to give] to you.

S<sub>3</sub>: The Benefactive Construction

Wo gei ni dai-le yihe tang.

I GEI you bring:COM one:CL candy

I've brought a box of candy for you.

The correct version of S<sub>1</sub> is given by (97), where the event of bringing the candy (and giving it to the indirect object) are understood to be completed without the need for any aspect markers:

97. Wo dai-gei ni yihe tang.

I bring:GEI you one:CL candy

I've brought you a box of candy.

In the benefactive construction, commands as well as propositions of future action may be encoded in its structure, as neither causation of having nor any completed event is an essential element of its semantic structure:<sup>29</sup>

98. Ni gei wo zhao-yi-zhao maozi.

you GEI me look:one:TENT cap

Have a look for my cap for me.

99. Gei wo lai feng xin!

GEI me come CL letter

Write me a letter! (do it for my benefit)

---

29. In the formalization of the semantic structures for S<sub>2</sub> and S<sub>3</sub>, however, only examples in the completive aspect have been considered for the purposes of comparison with S<sub>1</sub>.

100.        Zhang San yao gei Mali ji mingtian de shir.  
             (name)    want GEI (name) note tomorrow REL matter

Zhang San is going to note down tomorrow's matters for Mary.

#### CONCLUSION TO PART III

In this chapter on the benefactive construction ( $S_3$ ), I have set out to demonstrate that the latter can be given a unitary semantic representation and in so doing, argued against analyses which claim that this preverbal gei construction is ambiguous or even polysemous to the extent that it can be substituted for the ti and wei constructions.

The preverbal or benefactive gei construction encodes that the subject carries out some action with the intention of causing a good state of affairs to arise for the second person involved, and examples in the completive aspect encode in addition that this state of affairs is achieved. In this way it is a causative of benefit. The dative of transferral with enclitic gei encodes both the subject wanting to cause a second person to come to have an object which is with the subject prior to the action and subsequently causing this to happen.  $S_1$  is thus a causative of having.

Finally, the dative of intended benefit with postverbal gei, encodes an action that is intended to benefit the indirect object by causing this second person to come to have something which the latter can use. In this construction neither causation of having nor of benefit is encoded. Instead, the two components of causative intention, as described above, are encoded.

The semantic structures proposed for each of these three gei constructions distinguish their respective grammaticalized

meanings and usage clearly, yet we can also see that some components are present in two of the three constructions, notably those of intention to cause someone to have something and intention to cause benefit to someone. The first is present in both the semantic structures of  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  and 'intention to cause benefit' in both  $S_2$  and  $S_3$ . Nonetheless, it is not a surprising discovery since all three constructions make use of the same grammatical exponent gei. - Its presence cannot therefore be explained away as an arbitrary grammatical fact. However, the components for (intended) causation of having and (intended) causation of benefit are woven into the semantic structures of these three constructions in different ways, resulting in different sets of surface structure possibilities. These in turn are predicted by each semantic structure taken as a whole but never by individual grammatical constituents which cannot be considered responsible for, let alone directly correspond to, particular components of meaning.

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

The task of the semantic analysis presented here and carried out as part of my investigation into passive, causative and dative/benefactive constructions in Chinese has been to show that regardless of whether it be a case of a particular syntactic configuration being polysemous or a case of distinct syntactic configurations using an identical syntactic exponent, both syntactic phenomena share the characteristic that all the syntactic constructions involved will have distinct semantic structures.

In Parts I and II we saw that the syntactic configuration used by the bei passive, not to mention by all of the rang and jiao constructions - passive and causative - of

( bei )  
NP - ( rang ) - NP - VP  
( jiao )

was highly polysemous in that each type of construction (whether it be the bei passive, rang passive, jiao passive, rang causative or jiao causative) could be separated out into several discrete subconstructions distinguished by their semantic structure. The same case applied for the get passive in English with the configuration of

NP got V<sub>Tr</sub> ... ed.

The subconstructions of each type of construction were able to be separated out by first of all searching for structural differences such as the kind of predicate and the number of entities found to be encoded in, for example, each bei passive and importantly the semantic type to which each entity belonged such as animate, inanimate or personal. For the bei passive with a natural

force we saw that only one entity was encoded, and this was as the subject NP. It denoted a locale. In this construction, the agent NP represented a natural force rather than a person and consequently, the predicate an agentless event - one lacking in any intentional action. This contrasts with the type of predicate which is found to co-occur with the bei passive that has a person as the undergoer and an animate agent since this construction requires a verb of intentional action, not to mention two animate entities. These kinds of structural differences necessitated the separating out of the traditional bei passive into four discrete sub-constructions. The fact that the Europeanized form of the bei passive does not express adversity and that one of its sub-constructions has no overt expression of the agent while the other encodes only "collective" agents, combined with the fact that they are both restricted to the written language served as evidence to support the division into the two types.

The bei passive of bodily effect due to containing a third postverbal NP in its syntactic configuration and hence requiring three entities also proved to be different in its semantic requirements as to the kind of entities encoded and as a result more stringent in its syntactic requirements. Only parts of the body could be encoded as the post verbal noun and a resultative verb compound was an obligatory syntactic constituent.

The six subconstructions of the get passive were similarly semantically differentiated according to the kinds of entity involved and type of event.

The rang and jiao passive constructions although having the same syntactic configuration as the bei passive were also both successfully semantically and syntactically differentiated from it



in Part II - claims that they are the mere colloquial variants notwithstanding. That they all occupy different semantic space is particularly clear: For the bei, rang and jiao passives, for example, with the syntactic schema of

	(bei)			
NP	(rang)	NP		VP
P	(jiao)	P		

(specifically with a person as the undergoer), it was demonstrated that the rang passive was a passive of an avoidable event on the part of the undergoer identical to the case of the non-reflexive adversative get passive in English, while the serious nature of the passive event when encoded as the speaker's viewpoint by bei equally belies the viewing of the undergoer as an innocent victim of circumstance, that is, as one who could not have avoided the event. In contradistinction to these two kinds of passives, the jiao passive was claimed to be a "hot news" passive, expressing the speaker's viewpoint of the unexpected nature of the event.

The rang and jiao passive constructions were also syntactically and semantically differentiated from their respective complexes of causative constructions. Again, the causative constructions formed by rang and jiao were of the same syntactic configuration as the passives:

	(rang)			
NP	(jiao)	NP		VP

The marked difference in meaning between passives and causatives - the passive subject NP denoting the person who undergoes the event as opposed to the causative subject NP in many

causative constructions denoting the person who causes the event - led to a completely different set of syntactic behaviour for these two construction types concerning their mode of negation, aspectual marking and co-occurrence with modal verbs, despite the identity of their superficial syntactic configurations.

In addition to this, the complexes of rang and jiao causative constructions were likewise differentiated along the two principal parameters of semantics and syntax. The impression of many of the rang causatives as being "more polite" than their jiao counterparts or "less intense and expressive" in the case of other examples was accounted for in the semantic analysis in terms of the different kind of relationship holding between causer and causee which is assumed by the speaker - the difference of the causee not being willing not to do what the causer wants done in the case of the rang speech act causative and the causee having to do whatever the causer wants done in the case of the jiao speech act causative. Furthermore, it was verified that none of the jiao causatives express the meaning of 'let' or 'allow', despite claims to the contrary. It was contended that the six rang causatives and three jiao causatives all expressed different kinds of causation that varied along parameters such as intentional or unintentional causation on the part of the causer, or non-interference in an ongoing event which the subject could put an end to but refrains from doing so and with respect to the causee (or entity denoted by the pivot nominal): being caused to undertake an action, being caused to experience a new feeling or not being hindered from carrying out an action that one wants to carry out.

Some components of meaning were present in the semantic structure of several constructions with the same syntactic exponent

such as the rang causatives of non-interference and the rang passive and the jiao experiencer causatives and the jiao passive, evidence favouring the view that the choice of these syntactic exponents to form constructions with the particular grammaticalised meaning is not purely arbitrary. Nor can these syntactic exponents be considered to be "empty morphemes" as a result.

In Part III, en revanche, a study of constructions with distinct syntactic configurations and consequently distinct semantic structures was presented, diverging in their meaning despite the presence of an identical syntactic exponent in each construction: gei. This was shown first of all to be clearly the case for the two dative gei constructions - the dative of transferral with enclitic gei and the dative of intended benefit with postverbal gei. Secondly contrary to claims of polysemy for the benefactive gei construction to the effect that it sometimes means the same as either the ti or the wei construction, I showed that it can not only be semantically differentiated from the ti and wei constructions but also from the two dative constructions formed by gei. Hence, the benefactive construction with preverbal gei may not be regarded as mutually substitutable with either of ti or wei with which it shares the similar syntactic configuration of

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{NP} \quad ( \text{gei} ) \\ \quad \quad ( \text{ti} ) \quad + \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\ \quad \quad ( \text{wei} ) \end{array}$$

with a postverbal "prepositional phrase". Nor may it be regarded as having mutual transformational relations with either of the two gei dative constructions. In sum, if the preverbal gei construction is to be considered "polysemous" at all, then it is only so to the extent that this one syntactic configuration NP GEI + NP VP is

shared by both the adversative gei passive and the gei benefactive but not by the gei benefactive with the meanings otherwise grammaticalised by the preverbal ti and wei constructions. Moreover, due to the completely polarised meanings of the gei benefactive and the gei passive in the overall expression of benefit and adversity respectively, ambiguity does not present any problem in this case.

Despite the fact that the meanings grammaticalised by each of the three gei constructions is distinct, the use of the syntactic exponent gei is however not an arbitrary choice. The presence of certain components of meaning in pairs of gei constructions was described such as that of causative intention with respect to causing another to come to have something being present in both dative constructions or causative intention with respect to causing a beneficial state of affairs for another, present in both the dative of intended benefit and the benefactive construction. Above and beyond this presence of identical components in pairs of gei constructions, it was shown that only the dative of transferral encoded 'causation of having' while only the benefactive 'causation of benefit' with the different ways in which the components of each semantic structure interrelated accounting for the distinct grammaticalised meanings when each semantic structure is considered as a whole.

## SUMMARY OF CONSTRUCTIONS

### 1 SUMMARY OF PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FROM PART I

The six passive constructions formed by bei that were discussed and analysed in Part I are set out below for easy reference with the syntactic schema, the semantic formula and one example provided for each construction. Since this is a summary of constructions, no counterexamples are given. For this, the reader is referred back to the designated chapter or section for the justification of each semantic component by means of counterexamples.

The complete semantic formula for each construction is, however, presented which includes the 'illocutionary force' of each passive that distinguishes it from active voice constructions.<sup>1</sup> This particular feature was earlier discussed in Section 0.1 on the motivation for using the passive. The component stating the speaker's view that the event is one that is serious in nature is also included here.

Finally, it needs to be noted that past tense forms of verbs are used in all the semantic explications to represent the semantic property of completiveness (discussed in Chapter 1.3). This serves only as an abbreviated way of representing this property. A fuller explication of the notion of completiveness would rely heavily upon the use of the primitives 'I', 'world',

---

1 It is not conventional practice of course, to assign any 'illocutionary force' to grammatical constructions such as the passive. - The reader is referred to Wierzbicka (1980a) for the argument in favour of this.

'become', 'part' and 'think of'.<sup>2</sup> For purposes of readability, the less lengthy explications with the past tense of verbs are thus preferred, even though they are more semantically complex than an explication in terms of this set of primitives.

---

2 The reader is referred to Wierzbicka (1980<sup>b</sup>), Chapter 6 for a detailed explanation of how time references made by the speaker with respect to events can be explicated in terms of semantic primitives.

A. Passives formed by bei used in both literary and colloquial language:

I ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVE WITH A PERSON AS THE UNDERGOER

Syntactic Schema:

NP <sub>P</sub>	BEI	NP <sub>AN</sub>	VP <sub>COM</sub>
(Undergoer)		(Agent)	
Person A		Person B	

Example:

Mali	bei	ta	pian-le.
(name)	BEI	he	deceive:COM

Mary was tricked by him.

Semantic Formula:

Thinking of this person (A)  
I say:

Something happened to person A (event Y)  
because person B did something to A  
I'm thinking of Y as something serious<sup>2</sup>  
and something that was bad for A

I want to say something about person A  
not because I want to say something about  
anything else

I say something about person B  
because I want to say something about A

---

2 As pointed out in section 0.2, the component stating the serious nature of the event as viewed by the speaker, is justified in Chapters 5 and 6 of Part II where the semantic structures of the bei, rang and jiao passives are compared.

II            ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVE OF POSSESSIONS

Syntactic Schema:

(NP<sub>P</sub> + GEN)    NP<sub>POSS</sub>    BEI    NP<sub>AN</sub>    VP<sub>COM</sub>

Example:

Wo de liangben shu bei ta na-zou-le.  
I   GEN   two:CL    book BEI   he   take:away:COM  
Two of my books were taken away by him.

Semantic Formula:

Thinking of this thing (X)  
    which can be thought of as belonging to  
    Person A  
I say:

Something happened to X (event Y)  
because person B did something to X  
I'm thinking of Y as something serious and  
    something that was bad for person A

I want to say something about thing X  
because I want to say something about  
    person A

I say something about person B  
because I want to say something about X



III      ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVE WITH A NATURAL FORCE

Syntactic Schema:

NP<sub>LOC</sub>                      BEI                      NP<sub>F</sub>                      VP<sub>COM</sub>  
Place L

Example:

Zanmen              cunr              bei              hongshui              yan              -le.  
our              village              BEI              flood              submerge:COM  
Our village was submerged in a flood.

Semantic Formula:

Thinking of this place L  
I say:

Something happened in this place (L) (event Y)  
not because someone did something to L  
I'm thinking of Y as something serious and  
something that was bad for the people  
associated with place L

I want to say something about place L  
because I want to say something about  
the people associated with it

IV ADVERSATIVE BEI PASSIVE OF BODILY EFFECT

Syntactic Schema:

NP <sub>P</sub>	BEI	NP <sub>P</sub>	V <sub>R</sub>	<u>LE</u>	N <sub>BP</sub>
(Undergoer)		(Agent)			(Part of the body)
Person A		Person B			Body Part Z

Example:

Ta	bei	diren	da-shang-le	tui.
he	BEI	enemy	hit:wound:COM	leg

He was leg wounded through the enemy's firing.

Semantic Formula:

Thinking of this person (A)  
I say:

Something happened to person A (event Y)  
because person B did something to A  
a body part Z came to be in a certain state  
because of this

(Z can be thought of as part of person A's body)  
I don't need to say any more about body part Z  
Person A became unable to do something because  
of this

I'm thinking of Y as something serious and  
something that was bad for A

I want to say something about person A  
not because I want to say something about  
anything else

I say something about person B and body part Z  
because I want to say something about A

B. Exclusively Literary Passives formed by bei:

V AGENTLESS EUROPEANIZED PASSIVE

Syntactic Schema:

NP<sub>P</sub>                    BEI                    VP<sub>COM</sub>  
(Undergoer)

Person A

Example:

Ta                    bei                    xuanwei                    zhuxi.  
she                    BEI                    elect:as chairperson  
She was elected as chairperson.

Semantic Formula:

Thinking of this person (A)  
I say:

Something happened to person A  
because someone else did something to A  
I don't need to say who

I want to say something about A  
not because I want to say something about  
anything else

VI            EUROPEANIZED PASSIVE WITH A COLLECTIVE AGENT

Syntactic Schema:

NP <sub>P</sub>	BEI	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>COM</sub>
(Undergoer)		(Agent)	
Person A		Group B	

Example:

Jin Gui bei cunli xuancheng laodong yingxiong.  
(name) BEI village select:become labour hero  
Jin Gui was chosen as the labour hero by the village.

Semantic Formula:

Thinking of this person (A)  
I say:

Something happened to person A  
that these people B wanted  
because B did something to A

I want to say something about person A  
not because I want to say something about  
anything else

I say something about those people B  
because I want to say something about A

C. Passives formed by get in English:

I THE NON-REFLEXIVE 'ADVERSATIVE' GET PASSIVE:

N<sub>p</sub> got V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.

Jane got fired.

Something bad happened to this person (X)  
because someone else (Y) did something  
X could've done something else  
because of which this wouldn't have happened

II THE REFLEXIVE 'ADVERSATIVE' GET PASSIVE:

N<sub>p</sub> got reflexive pronoun V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.

Jane got herself fired.

Something bad happened to this person (X)  
because someone else (Y) did something  
because X had done something  
X could've not done this  
because of which it wouldn't have happened  
It can be thought of as if X wanted it to happen  
because of this

III THE NON REFLEXIVE 'BENEFICIAL' GET PASSIVE:

N<sub>p</sub> got V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.

Jane got promoted.

Something good happened to this person (X)  
because someone else (Y) did something  
that X wanted Y to do  
X had done something  
because X wanted it to happen  
Y could've done it because of that

IV THE REFLEXIVE 'BENEFICIAL' GET PASSIVE:

N<sub>P</sub> got reflexive pronoun V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.

Jane got herself promoted.

Something good happened to this person (X)  
because someone else (Y) did something  
that X wanted Y to do  
because X had done something  
because X wanted it to happen

V THE 'ADVERSATIVE' GET PASSIVE WITH AN INANIMATE SUBJECT:

(N<sub>P</sub>'s) N<sub>IN</sub> got V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.

Jane's bike got stolen.

Something happened to this thing (Y)  
which can be thought of as something bad  
that happened to this person (X)  
because someone else did something  
X could've done something else  
because of which this wouldn't have happened  
(Y can be thought of as X's Y)

VI THE 'BENEFICIAL' GET PASSIVE WITH AN INANIMATE SUBJECT:

(N<sub>P</sub>'s) N<sub>IN</sub> got V<sub>Tr</sub>...ed.

Jane's bike got fixed.

Something happened to this thing (Y)  
which can be thought of as something good  
that happened to this person (X)  
because someone else (Z) did something  
that X wanted Z to do  
X had done something  
because X wanted it to happen  
Z could've done it because of that  
(Y can be thought of as X's Y)

2 SUMMARY OF PASSIVE AND CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FROM PART II

A. SHI CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

I. STATIVE SHI CAUSATIVE OF UNINTENTIONAL CAUSATION

NP <sub>P</sub>	(VP)	SHI	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>STATIVE</sub>
Cause			Undergoer	
Person A			Person B	

Ta de bing shi wo hen danxin.  
 he GEN illness SHI I very worried

His illness caused me to be very worried.

Person B came to be in a certain state because of something that can be said about person A that B became aware of not because anyone wanted this to happen.

II. STATIVE SHI CAUSATIVE OF AGENTLESS CAUSATION

NP	(VP)	SHI	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>STATIVE</sub>
Subject			Pivot	
Cause			Undergoer	
			Person B	

Jiali mei ren shi ta bu fangxin.  
 home:in no people SHI he not at:ease

That nobody was at home caused him to feel uneasy.

Person B came to be in a certain state because of something that can be said about place L that B became aware of not because anyone wanted this to happen.

III. SHI CAUSATIVE OF NATURAL PHENOMENA

NP	(VP)	SHI	NP <sub>IN</sub>	VP
Causing Event			Caused Event or	State of Affairs

Heibanbing shi (\*rang) (\*jiao) meiguishu luo ye.  
 black:spot:disease SHI (\*RANG) (\*JIAO) rosebush drop:leaves  
 Black spot is causing the rosebushes to lose their leaves.

Something happened in a place  
 because of something else that can be said about  
 that place.

B. RANG CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

I. THE SPEECH ACT CAUSATIVE OF REQUEST WITH RANG

NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>ACTION</sub>
Subject		Pivot	
Causer		Causee	
Person A		Person B	

Shuji rang ta chuli - le zhejian shi.  
 party sec. RANG she deal:with : COM this:CL matter  
 The party secretary had her deal with this matter.

Assuming person B doesn't want not to do  
 what person A says he wants him to do  
 I say:

Person B did something that person A wanted him to  
 do  
 because A said he wanted B to do it.



II. SPEECH ACT CAUSATIVE OF PERMISSION WITH RANG

NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>ACTION</sub>
Causer		Causee	
Person A		Person B	

Ta yao shuo, ni jiu rang ta shuo!

she want speak, you just RANG she speak

If she wants to speak, you'd better let her!

Assuming that person B has to do what person A says he wants him to do:

I say:

Person B started to do something that B said s/he wanted to do

because person A said s/he could do it not because A wanted him to do it.

III. RANG CAUSATIVE OF NON-INTERFERENCE IN AN AGENTIVE EVENT

NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>ACTION</sub>
Subject		Pivot	
"Non-interfering"		Agent	
person			
Person A		Person B	

Rang ta nao-qu, kan ta neng nao-cheng shenmoyangr.

RANG he stir:go, see he can stir:become what:shape

Let him go on causing trouble, and see how far he can go.

Person B was doing something (Z)

Person A could've done something

because of which person B couldn't have kept on doing Z

A didn't do this

Person B kept on doing Z because of that

I'm thinking of it as bad for person B.

IV RANG CAUSATIVE OF NON-INTERFERENCE IN AN AGENTLESS EVENT

NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>IN</sub>	VP <sub>PROCESS</sub> EVENT
-----------------	------	------------------	--------------------------------

Subject	Pivot
"Non-interfering"	Undergoer
Person A	Thing X

Ta jiu zheyang rang chuan chen-diao-le.  
 he then this:way RANG boat sink:away:COM

This is the way he just let the boat sink.

Something was happening to thing X  
 (Thing X can be thought of as belonging to person P)  
 Person A could've done something  
 because of which this wouldn't have kept on  
 happening  
 A didn't do this  
 Thing X came to be in a certain state because of  
 this  
 not because A wanted this to happen  
 I'm thinking of it as bad for person P.

V. EXPERIENCER CAUSATIVE OF UNINTENTIONAL CAUSATION WITH RANG

NP <sub>P</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>EXPERIENTIAL</sub>
-----------------	------	-----------------	----------------------------

Unintentional Causer	Experiencer	Event
Person A	Person B	

Nei jiahuor rang ren wang-er-sheng-wei  
 that guy RANG one terrified:at:the:sight:of

That guy makes you feel terrified at the sight of him.

Person B came to feel something for a certain time  
 (not because he wanted to)  
 because of something that can be said about  
 person A  
 not because A wanted this to happen.





D. RANG PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

I. RANG PASSIVE OF AVOIDABILITY WITH A PERSON AS THE UNDERGOER

NP<sub>P</sub>                      RANG                      NP<sub>P</sub>                      VP<sub>COM</sub>

Person A                                      Person B

Ta      rang      Mali      (\*chui-peng)      piping-le.

he      RANG      (name)      (\*flatter)      criticize:COM

He got criticized (\*flattered) by Mary.

Something happened to person A  
because person B did something to A  
A could've done something  
because of which this wouldn't have happened  
A didn't do this  
I'm thinking of it as something bad that happened  
to A.

II. RANG PASSIVE OF AVOIDABILITY ON THE PART OF AN ADVERSELY  
AFFECTED OWNER

(NP <sub>P</sub> )	NP <sub>IN</sub>	RANG	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>COM</sub>
(Person A) "Owner"	Thing X "Possession"		Person B Agent	

Xiangpian rang xiao meimei si-le.

photo RANG little sister tear:COM

The photos got torn up by my little sister.

Thinking of thing X as belonging to person A  
I say:

Something happened to thing X (event Y)  
because person B did something to X  
Person A could've done something  
because of which Y wouldn't have happened  
Person A didn't do this  
I'm thinking of Y as something bad  
that happened to person A.

E. THE JIAO PASSIVE OF "HOT NEWS" WITH A PERSON AS UNDERGOER

NP <sub>P</sub>	JIAO	NP <sub>P</sub>	VP <sub>COM</sub>
Undergoer		Agent	

Ta jiao Xiao Mei gan-zou-le.

he JIAO (name) drive:away:COM

Person A Person B

He's just been chased out (of the room) by Xiao Mei!

Assuming you haven't heard about this,  
I say:

Something bad just happened to Person A (event Y)  
because person B did something to A  
I think nobody would've thought that Y could  
happen

3 SUMMARY OF CONSTRUCTIONS FROM PART III

I. S<sub>1</sub>: THE DATIVE OF TRANSFERRAL WITH ENCLITIC GEI

Syntactic Schema:

SUBJECT	-	VERB	-	GEI	-	INDIRECT OBJECT	-	DIRECT OBJECT
Person A						Person B		Thing X

Example:

Ta	jiao-gei	wo	yiba yaoshi,
he	hand:GEI	me	one:CL key

He handed me a key.

Semantic Formula:

Assuming that thing X is in place L with person A  
I say:

Person B came to have thing X  
because person A did something to X  
because A wanted B to have thing X

II. S<sub>2</sub>: THE DATIVE OF INTENDED BENEFIT WITH POSTVERBAL GEI

Syntactic Schema:

SUBJECT	-	VERB	-	DIRECT	-	GEI	-	INDIRECT
		PHRASE		OBJECT				OBJECT
Person A				Thing X				Person B

Example:

Ta		jiao-le		yiba yaoshi	gei		wo.
he		hand:COM		one:CL key	GEI		me

He handed a key to me.

Semantic Formula:

Person A does something  
because A wants person B to come to have  
a thing X that B can do something with  
Person A wants something good to happen  
to B because of this.



III. S<sub>3</sub>: THE BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTION WITH PREVERBAL GEI

Syntactic Schema:

SUBJECT - GEI - INDIRECT - VERB PHRASE  
OBJECT

Person A

Person B

Example:

Wo                gei        ta                ji-le    yifeng    xin.  
I                GEI        him                post:COM one:CL letter  
I posted a letter for him.

Semantic Formula:

Something happened to person B  
      that person A wanted  
because A did something  
I'm thinking of it as of something good for B

IV. THE TI CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIAL OBLIGATION

Syntactic Schema:

SUBJECT - TI - INDIRECT - VERB PHRASE  
OBJECT

Person A                      Person B

Example:

Zhang San    ti            Mali            song-le        yiben shu.  
(name)        TI            (name)        present:COM    one:CL book

Zhang San gave a present of a book (to someone else) on Mary's behalf.

Semantic Formula:

Assuming that person B has to do something (Z)  
at a certain time and that Z is something  
which B is capable of doing  
I say:

Person A did something (Z) that person B  
should've done  
because A knew that B couldn't do Z at this time  
Z was something that A felt should be done.

V. THE SYMBOLIC WEI CONSTRUCTION

Syntactic Schema:

SUBJECT - WEI - INDIRECT - VERB PHRASE  
OBJECT

Person A

Person B

Example:

Ta	wei	Li Si	pa-le	yizuo	shan.
she	WEI	(name)	climb:COM	one:CL	mountain

She climbed a mountain for Li Si's sake.

Semantic Formula:

Person A did something (Z)  
because A wanted to show person B  
that she felt good feelings towards B  
A imagined that something good could happen  
to B because of this (Z)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bally, Charles. (1926). "L'expression des idées de sphère personnelle et de solidarité dans les langues indo-européennes." Festschrift Gauchat. Aarau, 68-78.
- Bennett, Paul. (1981). "The evolution of passive and disposal sentences." JCL, 9, 61-89.
- Bolinger, Dwight. (1975). "Meaning and form: Some fallacies of asemanitic grammar." In E.F.K. Koerner (ed.) The Transformational-Generative Paradigm and Modern Linguistic Theory. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bolinger, Dwight. (1977). "Transitivity and spatiality: The passive of prepositional verbs." In A. Makkai (ed.) Linguistics at the Crossroads. Padova: Liviana Editrice.
- Chao, Yuen Ren. (1968). A Grammar of Spoken Chinese. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chappell, Hilary. (1978). "Semantics of some causatives in Chinese and English." Unpublished Honours thesis, Australian National University.
- Chappell, Hilary. (1980a). "Is the get passive adversative?" Papers in Linguistics, 13, 3, 411-452.
- Chappell, Hilary. (1980b). "The romanization debate." Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs, 4, 106-118.
- Chu, Chauncey. (1973). "The passive construction: Chinese and English." JCL, 1, 3, 437-469.
- Clark, Marybeth. (1974a). "Passive and ergative in Vietnamese." In Nguyen Dang-liem (ed.) South-East Asian Linguistic Studies. Series C. Canberra: A.N.U. Press.
- Clark, Marybeth. (1974b). "Submissive verbs as adversatives in some Asian languages." In Nguyen Dang-liem (ed.) South-East Asian Linguistics Studies. Series C. Canberra: A.N.U. Press.
- Curme, George. (1931). Syntax. Boston: Heath & Co.
- Ding Shengshu. 1961 (1979). Xiandai Hanyu Yufa Jianghua [A guide to modern Chinese grammar]. Beijing: Shangwu.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1972). The Dyirbal Language of North Queensland. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1973). "The semantics of giving." In M. Gross, M. Halle & M. Schutzenberger (eds) The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages. The Hague: Mouton.

- Fillmore, Charles. (1968). "The case for case." In E. Bach & R. Harms (eds) Universals in Linguistic Theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Gao Mingkai. (1957). Hanyu Yufa Lun [On Chinese grammar]. Beijing: Kexue.
- Green, Georgia. (1974). Semantics and Syntactic Regularity. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Guo Derun. (1981). Hanyu Changjian Juxing de Yongfa [Usage of common syntactic patterns in Chinese]. Beijing: Xinhua.
- Hatcher, Anna Granville. (1944). "Il me prend le bras vs. Il prend mon bras." The Romanic Review, 35, 156-164.
- Hatcher, Anna Granville. (1949). "To be/get invited." Modern Language Notes, 64, 7, 433-446.
- Hermann, Karen. (1979). "Coping with complex polysemy: A comparison of dative/benefactive constructions in Mandarin and Thai." BLS 5, 106-113.
- Hong Xinheng. (1956). Hanyu Yufa Wenti Yanjiu. [Studies in Chinese grammar]. Shanghai: Xin Zhishi.
- Hsu Chian-Li. (1974). "On the relationship between the active and passive in Chinese." JCL, 2, 2, 172-179.
- Hsu, Joseph. (1972). "To get or not to get." Fu Jen Studies in Language and Literature, 8, 65-85.
- Hu Zhu'an. (1960). "Dongci hou de 'gei' de cixing he shuang binyu wenti" [The grammatical function of postverbal gei and the double object construction]. Zhongguo Yuwen, 5, 222-4.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1924 (1968). The Philosophy of Grammar. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1931 (1949). A Modern English Grammar, Vol.4. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1933 (1979). Essentials of English Grammar. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Jiang Tian. (1980). Xiandai Hanyu Yufa Tongjie [Exposition of modern Chinese grammar]. Shenyang: Liaoning Renmin Chubanshe.
- Jing Shijun. (1980). Xiandai Hanyu Xuci [Function words in modern Chinese]. Huhehot: Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe.
- Keenan, Edward. (1978). "Foregrounding and backgrounding: The case of the passive." (Xerox). University of California, Los Angeles.

- Kratochvil, Paul. (1968). The Chinese Language Today. London: Hutchinson University Library.
- Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. (1973). "Serial verb constructions in Mandarin Chinese: Subordination or co-ordination?" In You Take the High Node and I'll Take the Low Node. GLS.
- Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. (1976). "Subject and topic: A new typology of language." In Charles N. Li (ed.) Subject and Topic. New York: Academic Press.
- Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. (1981). Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Li, Charles N., Sandra A. Thompson and R. McMillan Thompson. (1982). "The discourse motivation for the perfect aspect: The Mandarin particle le." In P.J. Hopper (ed.) Tense-Aspect. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Li Linding. (1980). "Beizi ju" [Sentences containing the preposition-particle bei]. Zhongguo Yuwen, 6, 401-412.
- Li Ying-che. (1971). An Investigation of Case in Chinese Grammar. South Orange: Seton Hall University Press.
- Li Ying-che. (1976). "Order of semantic units in Chinese." JCLTA, 11, 1, 26-38.
- Liang Donghan. (1960). "Xiandai hanyu de beidongshi" [The passive in modern Chinese]. Nei Menggu Daxue Xuebao, 2, 63-78.
- Liu Shiru. (1956). "Beidongshi de qiyuan" [The origin of the passive]. Yuwen Xuexi, 8, 32-33.
- Liu Wu-chi. (1966). An Introduction to Chinese Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Loh Dian-yang. (1959). Translation Its Principles and Technique (2 vols). Beijing: Shidai Chubanshe.
- Lord, Carol. (1973). "Serial verbs in transition." Studies in African Linguistics, 4, 3, 269-296.
- Lu, John H-T. (1975). "The grammatical item 'le' in Mandarin." JCLTA, 10, 2, 53-62.
- Lu, John H-T. (1977). "Resultative verbs vs. directional verb compounds in Mandarin." JCL, 5, 2, 276-313.
- Lü Shuxiang. (1941). Zhongguo Wenfa Yaolue [Outline of Chinese grammar]. Shanghai: Shangwu Yinshuguan.
- Lü Shuxiang. (1965). "Yuwen zhaji" [Notes on language]. Zhongguo Yuwen, 4, 137, 287-292.

- Lü Shuxiang. (1980). Xiandai Hanyu Babai Ci [Eight hundred words of modern Chinese]. Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan. ✓
- Lü Shuxiang and Zhu De-xi. 1952 (1980). Yufa Xiuci Jianghua [Guide to grammar and rhetoric]. Shanghai: Zhongguo Qingnian Chubanshe. ✓
- McCawley, J.D. (1971). "Tense and time reference in English." In C.J. Fillmore and T.C. Langendoen (eds) Studies in Linguistic Semantics. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. ✓
- Neumann, Dorothea. (1981). "The dative with body parts [in German]: Prepositional phrases indicating direction. Part 1." Unpublished ms, Australian National University. ✓
- Nikitina, T.N. (1958). "Kauzativnaia i passivnaia konstruktsii v kitaiskom iazyke" [Causative and passive constructions in Chinese]. Leningradskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet. Uchenye zapiski: Seriiia filologicheskikh nauk, 6, 236, 211-221. ✓
- Rajskaja, G.N. (1958). "Stradatel'naja konstrukcija v kitaiskom iazyke" [Passive constructions in Chinese]. Leningradskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet. Uchenye zapiski. Seriiia filologicheskikh nauk, 6, 236, 222-229. ✓
- Ren Xueliang. (1981). Han-Ying Bijiao Yufa [A comparative grammar of Chinese-English]. Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue. ✓
- Rice, Wallace. (1932). "Get and got". American Speech, 7, 280-296. ✓
- Sapir, E. (1917-1920). Review of Uhlenbeck, C.C., "Het Passieve Karakter van het Verbum Transitivum van het Verbum Aktionis in Talen van Noord-Amerika." IJAL, 1, 82-86.
- Sapir, E. (1917-1920). Review of Uhlenbeck, C.C., "Het Indentificeerend Karakter der Possessieve Flexie in Talen van Noord-Amerika." IJAL, 1, 86-90.
- Schachter, Paul. (1974). "A non-transformational account of serial verbs." Studies in African Linguistics, Supplement 5, 253-277.
- Tai Tian Chen Fu. (1957). "Shuo gei" [Concerning gei]. Yufa Lunji [Collection of essays on grammar], vol.2. In Yuwen Huibian, 25, 84. Beijing: Zhonghua.
- Tang, Charles T.C., Jeffrey Tung and Anthony Wu. (1972). Papers in Linguistics in Honor of Professor A.A. Hill. Taipei: Rainbow Bridge Book Co. ✓
- Tang Qiyun. (1980). Juzi Chengfen Lunxi [Analysis of syntactic constituents] Shanghai: Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Teng Shou-hsin. (1973). "Negation and aspects in Chinese." JCL, 1, 1, 14-37.
- Teng Shou-hsin. (1974). "Negation in Chinese." JCL, 2, 2, 125-140.

- Teng Shou-hsin. (1975). A Semantic Study of Transitivity Relations in Chinese. Publications in Linguistics, Vol.80. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thompson, Sandra A. (1973a). "Resultative verb compounds in Mandarin Chinese: A case for lexical rules." Language, 49, 2, 361-379.
- Thompson, Sandra A. (1973b). "Transitivity and some problems with the ba construction." JCL, 1, 2, 208-221.
- Visser, F. Th. (1969). An Historical Syntax of the English Language. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Waller, D.J. (1970). The Government and Politics of Communist China. London: Hutchinson University Library.
- Wang Huan. (1957). "Ba zi ju he bei zi ju" [Ba sentences and bei sentences]. Shanghai: Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Wang Li. 1944 (1955). Zhongguo Yufa Lilun [Theory of modern Chinese grammar] (2 vols). Shanghai: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Wang Li. 1947 (1956). Zhongguo Xiandai Yufa [Modern Chinese grammar] (2 vols). Shanghai: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Wang Li. 1957. "Hanyu beidongshi de fazhan" [The development of the passive in Chinese]. In Yuyanxue Luncong, 1, 1-16. Shanghai: Xin Zhishi.
- Wang Li. 1964 (1980). Gudai Hanyu [Classical Chinese] (4 vols). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Wang Li. 1980. Hanyu Shigao [Draft history of the Chinese language] (2 vols). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Wang Liaoyi. (1957). Hanyu Yufa Gangyao [Essentials of Chinese grammar]. Shanghai: Xin Zhishi.
- Warburton, Irene. (1975). "The passive in English and Greek." Foundations of Language, 13, 563-578.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. (1972). Semantic Primitives. Frankfurt: Athenäum Verlag.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. (1979a). "Ethno-syntax and the philosophy of grammar." Studies in Language, 3, 3, 313-383.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. (1979b). "Are grammatical categories vague or polysemous? The Japanese 'adversative' passive in a typological context." Papers in Linguistics, 12, 1/2, 111-162.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. (1980a). The Case for Surface Case. Linguistica Extranea, Studia 9. Ann Arbor: Karoma.



- Wierzbicka, Anna. (1980b). Lingua Mentalis: The Semantics of Natural Language. Sydney: Academic Press.
- Xiang Ruo. (1960). "Guanyu gei de cixing" [Concerning the grammatical function of gei]. Zhongguo Yuwen, 2, 64-65.
- Yang Xin'an. (1960). "Shuo gei" [Concerning gei]. Zhongguo Yuwen, 2, 66-68.
- Zhang Zhigong. (1957). Hanyu Yufa Changshi [General knowledge of Chinese grammar] Shanghai: Xin Zhishi.
- Zhao Enzhu. (1956). "Tan shou, ai, zao he you" [On shou, ai, zao and you]. Zhongguo Yuwen, 53, 48-50.
- Zhongguo Kexueyuan Yuyan Yanjiusuo Yufa Xiaozu [Grammar group of the Linguistics Institute, Chinese Academy of Sciences.] (1953). "Yufa jianghua (jiu): Zhudongci" [Introduction to grammar (9): Auxiliary verbs]. Zhongguo Yuwen, 3, 28-30.
- Zhu De-xi. (1979). "Yu dongci gei xiangguan de jufa wenti" [Syntactic problems associated with the verb gei]. Fangyan, 2, 81-87.

Abbreviations used in the bibliography

- BLS = Berkeley Linguistics Society  
CLS = Chicago Linguistics Society  
IJAL = International Journal of American Linguistics  
JCL = Journal of Chinese Linguistics  
JCLTA = Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association.