TOPICALIZATION AND THE QUESTION OF LEXICAL PASSIVES IN CHINESE[1]

Randy J. LaPolla
Department of Linguistics
UC Berkeley

Introduction

This paper is one argument for a theory of grammatical relations in Chinese in which there are no grammatical relations beyond semantic roles, and no lexical relation-changing rules. As the passive rule is one of the most common relation changing rules cross-linguistically, in this paper I will address the question of whether or not Mandarin Chinese has lexical passives, that is, passives defined as in Relational Grammar (see for example Perlmutter and Postal 1977) and the early Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) literature (e.g. Bresnan 1982), where a 2-arc (object) is promoted to a 1-arc (subject).[2] In these cases, the passive meaning of the sentence is determined in the argument structure of the verb, so that in the lexicon there are pairs of related verbs, one active and one passive. These two forms are related by redundancy rules or, as in the new analysis of passives within Lexical-Functional Grammar, by a lexical rule that causes the agent to become an oblique argument (Bresnan 1987, Bresnan & Kanerva 1988). We will see that Mandarin Chinese does not have this type of passive (contrary to the analysis in Tan 1988). Only if we look at passives from the point of view of pragmatics and define passives as constructions which defocus the agent and emphasize the affectedness of the patient (Shibatani 1985) can Chinese be said to have passives. The major difference between the former and the latter definitions is the specification of grammatical function rather than semantic role. We will see that in the sentences commonly referred to as 'passive' in Chinese, though there is a increase in the affectedness of the patient, and a defocusing of the agent, there is no difference between 'active' and 'passive' in terms of grammatical function vis à vis the main verb.[3] That is, there is only one

---

[1] I would like to thank Charles Fillmore, James Matisoff, and Paul Kay for their very helpful comments on the drafts of this paper. I also benefited greatly from discussions with Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. Any mistakes or errors of judgement are of course my own. My participation in this conference was supported by a travel grant from the Institute of East Asian Studies, U.C. Berkeley.

[2] Marantz (1984:8-9) defines passives as cases where the 'logical object of a grammatically intransitive verb corresponds to the subject of the VP that the verb heads', but this is not sufficient for passives, as it is also the LFG definition of unaccusatives (see for example Baker 1983).

[3] Noonan & Woock (1978) give a similar analysis for 'passives' in Lango. They distinguish between a structural passive and a functional passive, the latter being a rule that changes word order, certain referential properties and the 'orientation' of a sentence, but does not change grammatical functions. Foley & Van Valin (1985:326) still consider the Lango foregrounding structure to be a passive

subcategorization frame for each verb in the lexicon, the 'active' frame, and this is the same for all types of sentences. The shifts in focus and affectedness which give the sentences a 'passive' feeling are accomplished either through simple topicalization with a deleted agent[4], or through topicalization with an added topic affectedness marker, *bei*. Before beginning to discuss the details of this analysis, I will first discuss topicalization and complementation in Chinese.

Topicalization and Complementation

Topicalization is of two types in Chinese, to sentence initial position (sentence (1)), and to immediate post-subject position (sentence (2)):[5]

(1)   shu   John dou du   le
        books   all   read ASP
        The books, John read (them all).

(2)   John shu   dou du   le
               books all   read ASP
        John read all the books.

It is common with topicalization to have a complement. This complement can be either a subjectless adjunct (XADJ) (*gei ni ting* in sent. (3)) or, more commonly, a subjectless complement (XCOMP), usually a resultative complement (*zai laji tong* in sent. (4)):

(3)   zhe shou ge   wo chang gei ni ting
        this CL   song I   sing give you listen
        This song I will sing for you.

(4)   nei ben huang se   de shu wo reng   zai   laji   tong
        that CL yellow color REL book I throw exist garbage pail
        That pornographic book, I threw (it) in the garbage pail.

In sentence (3), as *wo* 'I' is the subject of both *chang* 'sing' and *gei* 'give', the functional control relation of the subject of the complement is (⁄SUBJ)=(⁄XADJ SUBJ), and does not involve the TOPIC function. In sentence (4), as *nei ben huang se de shu* is the theme of *reng* and the subject of *zai*, the functional control relation is (⁄OBJ)=(⁄XCOMP SUBJ). This argument is in topic position and assumes the TOPIC function.

---

construction because of the cross-clause referential properties of the fronted NP. The concept of changing pragmatic role without changing grammatical function is also discussed by Comrie (1988).

[4]Examples of the use of this type of non-passive foregrounding to achieve the foregrounding effect of a passive are given for Lakhota in Foley & Van Valin 1985:334.

[5]Li & Thompson (1974) and Yang (1980) would consider *shu* 'book' the topic in only the first of these two examples. This question and others concerned with the nature of topic vs. subject in Chinese will be dealt with in a later paper. For the purposes of the present paper I will consider any fronted constituent a type of topic.

It is also possible to have a pronoun anaphorically bound to this argument that has the TOPIC function[6] without changing the functional control relationship, as in sentence (5):

(5) nei ben huang se   de shu wo ba   ta reng zai laji   tong
       that CL yellow color REL book I PART it throw exist garbage pail
       That pornographic book, I threw it in the garbage pail.

The Nature of Passives

Keenan (1975) gives the definition of relational passives in terms of the grammatical relations (GRs) 'subject of' (Su) and 'direct object of' (DO), such that in a passive '... (i) the active Su ceases to bear any GR to its verb and (ii) DO becomes Su' (p. 340). To satisfy (i), the demoted Su will either be totally absent from the passive sentence, or it will appear as an oblique phrase. Because of (ii), passive sentences are intransitive, as the DO of the verb has become the subject.

The new LFG formulation of passives (Bresnan & Kanerva 1988) is that the highest role on the thematic hierarchy (ag > ben > go/exp > inst > th/pt > loc) maps onto a thematically restricted function. Generally, this means an agent, which alternates between SUBJ and OBL, will be mapped onto an oblique function, causing the theme, which alternates between OBJ and SUBJ, to take on the SUBJ function.

If we are to find lexical passives in Chinese, then, they should have the qualities mentioned above: the direct object of the active should become the subject of the passive, the subject of the active should lose any subcategorized grammatical relation to the verb, and the verb should become intransitive.

Before we go on to look at 'passivization' in Chinese, I would like to discuss briefly the referent-tracking discourse function of passives. There are four systems of discourse referent-tracking systems used in languages of the world: (a) inference, (b) gender/number/noun class, (c) switch-reference, and (d) switch-function (Foley & Van Valin 1984, Ch. 7; Van Valin 1987). The two types we are most familiar with are inference, where tracking of a referent is purely a matter of pragmatics, and switch-function, where a referent is tracked by changing its grammatical function. Type (b) is common in for example Bantu languages, which have a complicated system of noun classes to track referents; switch-reference is where suffixes on the verb mark a referent's coreference or non-coreference with a participant in the following clause. Chinese definitely does not use type (b) or (c), so we will only look at (a) and (d).

---

[6]A *ba* phrase is used to do this. I have glossed *ba* as PART to avoid discussing its nature here. Suffice it to say that I feel *ba* to be an agentivity/transitivity enforcing disposal marker. I have glossed *bei* in the same way, because at this time I am agnostic as to its form class.

All languages use inference to some extent (and possibly some other combination of the four types), but Chinese uses inference exclusively[7] (Cf. Li & Thompson 1979, Cheng 1988 - see Cheng 1988 also for correction of some of LI & Thompson's data).

Well defined subjects and voicing distinctions are necessary in a switch-function language such as English because '[c]oreferential zero anaphora is possible only on a "subject" to "subject" basis, and consequently for this system to operate, it must be possible for the NP referring to the participant being tracked to be the "subject" of its clause' (Van Valin 1987:528). As there is no well defined concept of subject (see below) and referent tracking does not make reference to grammatical function in Chinese,[8] voicing distinctions are not necessary for referent tracking.

'Passivization' in Chinese

In Chinese there are two sentence patterns that are usually considered passive constructions.[9] An example of the first type is sentence (6):

(6) shu   dou kan wan   le
    books all   read finish ASP
    The books were all read/(I/he) finished reading all the books

This type of 'passive' is formed by dropping the agent/subject of a topicalized form such as the following:

(7)   shu wo/ta dou kan wan   le
        books I/he all   read finish ASP

            or the equivalent

        wo/ta shu   dou kan wan   le
        I/he   books all   read finish ASP

---

[7]Huang 1984 discusses certain restrictions on the reference of zero objects within a single sentence, that is, 'in contexts in which pragmatic or discoursal factors are reduced to the minimum'(p. 539), though there is no problem if the zero object's reference is the discourse topic (p. 541). Huang (1984) also argues for the distinction between 'discourse-oriented' languages and 'sentence-oriented' languages, and points out (p.540 ff.) that in Chinese, pragmatics can 'override' grammar in the interpretation of zero anaphora.

[8]If anything, it is the topic that is most important in the determination of zero anaphora (Tao 1986; Cheng 1988).

[9]There is a third type that would be considered passive in the analysis of Langacker & Munro (1975), where a clause is embedded in a 'stative-existential' predicate with the object taking the subject position, and that is the *shi ... de* construction exemplified in (i):

(i)   Zhangsan shi Lisi da   de.
                COP   hit NOM
        Zhangsan was hit by Lisi./It was Lisi who hit Zhangsan.

This is actually not a passive, but a type of clefting that puts the agent NP in focus when the topic is the direct object. (Li & Thompson 1981:499-500).

This type of passive can only be done with inanimate objects;[10] as there is no passive morphology, an animate noun in preverbal position would have to be interpreted as the agent/subject of the verb unless intonation or some other clue informs the listener that it is the object of the verb. It is clear from this that there really is no passive sense to the verb in this type of construction, and that in *shu dou kan wan le*, *shu* cannot be the subject. It must then be a topic/object in a sentence without a subject. A similar analysis is given in Li & Thompson 1976:479-450, and Li & Thompson 1981:498-499.

The second type of 'passive' in Chinese will be the main focus of this paper. It has the particle *bei* after the initial ('passivized') NP and before the agent, if there is one:

(8)   John bei   Mary da le
              PART   hit ASP
        John was hit by Mary.

For many verbs, especially ditransitives, this type of construction can not be used. If we were to try to produce the Chinese equivalents of sentences (10) and (11), the results would be ungrammatical.

(9)   Louise gave the children a book.
(10)   A book was given to the children by Louise.
(11)   The children were given a book by Louise

The equivalent of sentence (9) would be (12):

(12)   Louise gei haizi   shu.
         Louise give child(ren) book(s)

The equivalents of (10) and (11) would be (13) and (14) respectively:

(13)   *shu bei   Louise gei haizi
         book PART Louise give child(ren)

(14)   *haizi bei   Louise gei shu
         child PART Louise give book

Even if these sentences were grammatical, there would still be the problem of whether or not the agent could be made oblique. This is important to the LFG lexical mapping formulation of the passive rule, in which the main function of the passive rule is to make the agent oblique. For the agent to be oblique on the surface, it should be

---

[10]The exception to this is when it it logically clear that the sentence initial animate NP could not possibly be the agent, as in (i) (from Li 1986):

(i)   Ta qiechu le   liuzi le.
         2sg cut-outASP tumorASP
         He cut out (his) tumor.

preceded by a preposition, yet the particle *bei* cannot properly be considered a preposition (M.J. Hashimoto 1968:66), as it can appear without a following noun phase, something no preposition can do.[11]   As we will see below, in these 'passive' sentences, the agent is still the subject of the verb, so cannot be oblique.

There is also the problem of the goal being the direct object of the verb. In the LFG theory of lexical encoding, the goal of sentence (12) is an OBJ2.[12] If the theme becomes the SUBJ because the agent is made an OBL (oblique) argument, then the goal must either become an OBL or the OBJ (assuming that a single 'objectlike' argument would have to be an OBJ and not an OBJ2). Neither of these are possible with this verb.[13]

This is true for all ditransitive verbs. Looking at verbs with only one object, such as *da* 'hit' in sentence (8), it seems as if the lexical rule for passive does produce grammatical sentences, but we need to look further at the grammatical relations between the constituents of the sentence.

Grammatical Relations in *bei* Sentences

Aside from the problem of 'obliqueness' mentioned above, if *bei* constructions are lexical passives, what precedes *bei* should be the subject of the main verb. This seems to be the case in (8) (reproduced below), but the situation becomes more complicated if we consider a more typical type of *bei* sentence, as in (15).

---

[11]According to Tao 1986, *bei* and *gei* are the only two 'coverbs' that can take a zero object. Though Chinese was not discussed explictly in Nichols 1986 because of its lack of morphology, Nichols (pers. comm.) feels it should be possible to classify languages without morphology as either head-marking or dependant-marking based on their syntax. Given the syntactic patterns in Nichols 1986, then, it is possible to classify Chinese as dependant-marking. If this is the case, then it is highly unlikely that *bei* without an agent is an endocentric prepositional phrase where the dependant has been deleted.

[12]There have been some very recent changes in the formulation of the passive in LFG as regards ditransitives (Joan Bresnan, pers. comm.), such that the theme argument is now considered to be 'intrinsically' classified either as unrestricted or 'objective'. The latter would obtain when there is another unrestricted argument, the goal. The problem with this is that if these classifications hold, there is no way to have the theme become a SUBJ, as only unrestricted arguments can become SUBJs.

[13]With a small number of other ditransitive verbs (those expressing 'giving' or 'sending'), it is possible to have the goal in other than immediate post-verbal position by putting it in an adjunct phrase with *gei* 'give', but this breaks the sending and giving into two clauses/actions:

(i)   wo song shu   gei   haizi   le
           I   send book(s) give   children ASP
           I sent (a) book(s) to the children.

This alternate form is not possible with ditransitives where there is no actual giving:

(ii)   *wo gaosu yi jian shi   gei   ni.
            I   tell   one CL affair give   you
           I'll tell you about something.

(8)   John bei   Mary da le
        John PART Mary hit ASP
        John was hit by Mary.

(15)   John bei   Mary da si   le
        John PART Mary hit die ASP
        John was beaten to death by Mary.[14]

      In the latter case there is a resultative complement (XCOMP), where the subject of *si* 'to die' is the theme of *da* 'to hit'. If broken into two clauses, it would be the equivalent of 'John was beaten by Mary, John died.' In a single clause, the way it is here, these grammatical relationships still hold; so if we assume that *John* is the subject of *da* because *da* is made passive by *bei*, and it is also the subject of *si,* then it is difficult to explain the control relationship in a sentence with a pronoun anaphorically bound to the initial NP, as in (16):[15]

(16)   John bei   Mary ba   ta da si   le
        John PART Mary PART him hit die ASP
        John was beaten to death by Mary.

In this case, it is clear that *John* is the object of *da*, as *ba* marks a fronted direct object. Otherwise, as *John* and *ta* 'him' are understood as anaphorically bound, *John* would be both the subject and the object of *da*, violating the function-argument biuniqueness condition, which states that 'each lexical role is associated with a unique function, and conversely' (Bresnan 1987:3). We see then that the control relation and voice of the verb are the same as those for a topicalized form such as sentence (5). It is possible to express the same meaning as sentence (16) simply using topicalization[16], though *John* is slightly less 'affected' in this form:

(17)   John, Mary ba   ta da si   le
        John Mary PART him hit die ASP
        John, Mary beat him to death.

The only difference between the structure of (17) and that of (16) is the existence of the particle *bei* in the latter. In both cases the topic, *John*, is the object of *da* and the subject of *si*. It is largely because of the lack of 'affectedness' of the pre-bei argument

---

[14]I am using English passives to translate the *bei* sentences, because that is the custom, but the actual meaning is closer to 'John suffered Mary's beating him to death'. The bei construction developed historically from just this type of construction (NP + *bei* 'suffer' + nominalized VP). (Cf. Peyraube 1988).

[15]It is possible within the theory of LFG to have an object instantiated both by a pronoun and by a lexical noun, because a pronoun can lose its semantic attribute (the pronominal status marked by PRED) while keeping its grammatical attributes (NUM, PERSON, etc.), as the latter are not unique with each instantiation. In this way the pronoun becomes an object agreement marker. (Cf. Bresnan and Mchombo 1987:53)

[16]For Van Valin (1985) sentence (17) would be an example of left-dislocation rather than topicalization, because of the presence of the prounoun which refers to the topic.

that a sentence such as (13) is ungrammatical. It is possible to topicalize a sentence with *gei* 'give', but it is not possible to have a *bei* sentence with *gei* as the main verb, as the arguments of the verb are not directly affected by the action of giving.. *Bei* is a patient-focus disposal marker.[17] That is, it emphasizes that something has affected the patient in some way. This is why it is almost always used with resultative constructions. In emphasizing the affectedness of the patient, *bei* is similar to passives in other languages, but in the case of *bei* there isn't the change of grammatical relations that is involved in passivization in other languages. It is interesting to note that according to Hopper & Thompson (1980), passives are detransitivizing and (at least in English) generally take inanimate subjects. According to them also (and Thompson 1973), the *ba* construction is a highly transitive construction. The question then is if *bei* sentences are passive and so detransitivizing, why are they used with a transitivizing *ba* construction? A *ba* construction in a *bei* sentence requires the presence of an agent. This violates the RG specification that the agent have no grammatical function vis à vis the verb. Also, contrary to the case for English passives, animate pre-*bei* NPs are very common.[18] Let's look at some more facts about *bei* sentences.

      In *bei* sentences, it is possible to drop the agent, but not *bei:*

(18)   John bei   da si le
          John PART hit die ASP
          John was beaten to death.

If *bei* were removed, *John* would have to be interpreted as the agent of *da*, and so would be the one doing the hitting rather than the one hit. The *bei* particle informs the listener that *John* is not the agent, but is the receiver of the action. In topicalization, a pause is necessary after the topic to mark it as such. This pause is not necessary when the sentence-initial NP is clearly a topic because of its inanimacy or the presence of the particle *bei*.

      Further evidence that the pre-*bei* NP is a topic rather than a subject, and that the verb is still in the active voice, is the existence of sentences where there is a direct

---

[17]As I mentioned in footnote (5), I consider *ba* to be an agentivity/transitivty enforcing disposal marker. The difference in focus between these two types of disposal marker is one reason why it is possible to have *gei* with a *ba* construction but not with a *bei* construction: there is agentivity in giving, but there is no real effect on either of the two objects. (This implies that giving does not always involve movement.) The other reason is to avoid confusion between *gei* as a main verb and *gei* in a benefactor-highlighting construction. See also Ma 1987 on the close relationship between the *ba* and *bei* constructions.

[18]Though I have not yet done a thorough discourse study on the use of the *bei* sentence, my guess is that contrary to the use of passives in languages such as English, the *bei* sentence would be used in foregrounded clauses (in the sense of Hopper 1979), which 'generally refer to events which are dynamic and active' (Hopper 1979:215).

object (the 'retained object' discussed in connection with the *ba* construction in Thompson 1973) after the verb, and the pre-*bei* NP is not an argument of the verb:

(19) muji   bei   lang chi le   yi zhi xiao jir
      mother hen PART wolf eat ASP one CL   little chick
      The mother hen had one of her chicks eaten by a wolf.

(20) John bei wo ge le ta (de)   yi zhi shou
      John PART I   cut ASP he (GEN) one CL hand
      John had a hand cut off by me.

These sentences are examples of possessor-ascension (Fox 1981) in Chinese. There is a genitive relationship between the topic and the direct object.[19] In these examples, if the NP + *bei* part of the sentence is removed, what is left is still a full sentence, clearly with the active voice:

(19') lang chi le   yi zhi xiao jir
      wolf eat ASP one CL small chick
      The wolf ate one chick.

(20') wo ge   le ta de yi zhi shou
      I   cut (off) ASP he GEN one CL hand
      I cut off one of his hands.

It can be seen that in (19), *muji* is neither the subject or the direct object of *chi* 'eat', but is affected by the action of the wolf eating a chick. This fact and the fact that the subject of *chi* is not oblique in these sentences violates both the conditions for passive structures given in the discussion of the nature of passives above.

     Li (1986:348) presents examples of sentences where the instrument of the action is in topic position (ex. 21), and examples of the same structure, but with the particle *bei* (ex. 22):

(21) shengzi wo kun le   xiangzi   le

---

[19]It would seem that these sentences violate the Extended Coherence Condition , which says that 'the functions TOPIC and FOCUS must be linked to predicate-argument structure either by being functionally identified with subcategorized functions, or by anaphorically binding subcategorized functions' (Sells 1985:182), because in these cases the TOPIC function is not an argument of the verb. Li & Thompson (1981:472) claim that the possessive relationship is inferred, not structurally specified, but we could also see the topic as being linked to only a part of a predicate-argument function, as shown in a possible f-structure for sentence (19):

$$
\begin{vmatrix}
\text{TOP} & [\text{PRED} & \text{'muji'}] & & \\
\text{SUBJ} & [\text{PRED} & \text{'lang'}] & & \\
\text{OBJ} & \begin{vmatrix} \text{POSS} & [\quad] & \\ \text{PRED} & \text{'xiao jir'}\langle(/\text{POSS})\rangle\text{'} \end{vmatrix} & \\
\text{PRED} & \text{'eat}\langle(/\text{SUBJ})(/\text{OBJ})\rangle\text{'} & & \\
\end{vmatrix}
$$

I will assume that this type of possessor-ascension is allowable within the framework of the Extended Coherence Condition.
     The f-structure for sentence (20) would be similar, except that there is an anaphorically bound pronoun in the POSS position.

        rope   1sg tie ASP box   ASP
        I tied the box with the rope.

(22)   shengzi bei wo kun le   xiangzi le
        rope   1sg tie ASP box   ASP
        I tied the box with the rope.

In this type of construction, not only is the topic/pre-bei NP not a subcategorized argument of the verb, it is not even the possessor of a subcategorized argument. This is a serious problem for a lexical analysis, and cannot be resolved by rule stretching such as that in footnote 19.

      A *bei* sentence can also contain what Li & Thompson (1981:324) call 'agent-oriented' adverbs such as *gong ping de* 'fairly', *yanli de* 'sternly', *you limao de* 'politely', etc. These can only occur with an agent that is an argument of the verb[20]. Other cases where it is not possible to delete the agent is when there is an adjunct preposition phrase (example from McCawley 1988):

(23)   Zhangsan bei Lisi/*Ø yong gunzi da le.
                          use   stick hit ASP
        Zhangsan was hit with a stick (by Lisi).

      In sentence (24) and (18) above, the structure is as in (25):

(24)   zhangsan bei   reng zai   di   shang
        zhangsan PART throw exist ground on
        John was thrown to the ground.

(25)   TOPIC PART V XCOMP

where the topic is both the object of the main verb and the subject of the verbal complement (($/$OBJ)=($/$XCOMP SUBJ)). This same structure can also take certain intransitive verbs, though with intransitives, the pre-*bei* topic of a sentence such as (26), below, has the same type of genitive/partitive relationship to the object of the XCOMP[21] that it has to the matrix post-verbal object in sentences such as (19) and (20). It is not the object of the main verb, as the main verb has no object, and clearly not the subject of the main verb:

---

[20]A.Y. Hashimoto (1971) feels the nonocurrence of this type of manner adverbial before *bei* supports her argument (and that of M.J. Hashimoto 1968) that the bei sentence is derived from an embedding structure. See below for more on this analysis.

[21]Achievement verbs such as diao 'fall' in this example are the Chinese equivalents of 'unaccusative' verbs, as discussed in Perlmutter 1978 and Van Valin 1988 (see the latter for the aspectual basis for 'unaccusativity'). The single argument of this type of verb can precede or follow the verb, or, if the argument is a possessor-possessed phrase, it can be split, with the possessor preceding the verb and the possessed following the verb, as it is in example (26).

(26)   xianglian bei   ta   pao diao   le   san ke zhuzi
         necklace PART he/she run lose/drop ASP three CL bead
         The necklace dropped three beads because of her running.
                                        (This example from Tan 1987:285)

The 'active' form of this sentence would then be as in (27):

(27)   ta   pao diao   le xianglian de   san ke zhuzi
         he/she run lose/drop ASP necklace GEN three CL bead
         He/she lost three beads of (her) necklace because of (her) running.

    A third type of *bei* sentence where there can be a post verbal object is when the pre-*bei* NP is a location:[22]

(28)   di   shang bei   sa   le hao duo   shui
         ground on   PART sprinkle ASP very much water
         On the ground was sprinkled a lot of water.

    All of these examples express a type of passive meaning, if we take defocusing of the agent as 'the main pragmatic function of passives' (Shibatani 1985:837), and not define passives in terms promotion to subject (Cf. Perlmutter and Postal 1977). The topic is always affected in some way by the action of the main verb,[23] but it is not always anaphorically bound to, or functionally identified with, the direct object (or any other argument) of the verb. It can also simply functionally control the subject or object of the verbal complement, be in a genitive relationship with the object, or it may not be related to anything else in the sentence, as in examples (22) and (28). In example (28), what is topicalized is an adjunct, so it is not bound to anything else in the sentence. The 'active' equivalent of (28) would be (29):

(29)   wo zai   di shang   sa   le   hao duo   shui
         I   LOC ground on   sprinkle ASP very much water
         I sprinkled a lot of water on the ground.[24]

Conclusions

---

[22]As Hanson (1987:107) has pointed out for French, 'In topic constructions, when the argument to which a topic is bound is one which could be expressed as a prepositional phrase, a preverbal topic constituent will not include the preposition ...'

[23]Shibatani (1985:841) says that it is this affectedness of what he calls the passive subject that leads to the use of passive structures for indirect affectedness, as in those sentences with post-verbal objects given above. He gives examples of similar indirect passives in Japanese and Korean. It is important to note that in those languages, which both have clear marking of topic vs. subject, what Shibatani calls the 'passive subject' is clearly marked as a topic.

[24] A note on *zai* constructions: In general, a pre-verbal *zai* is an adjunct which marks the location of the action of the main verb, as in (29); a post-verbal *zai* is a verbal complement which marks the location of the object of the main after it has been acted upon, as in (24), but see Zhu 1979 and Solnit 1981 for discussions of possible ambiguity of locative scope. It is possible to argue that the locative in this sentence is a subcategorized argument

We can see from all of these examples that the pre-bei NP is not the subject of the main verb; that the grammatical relations in 'passive' sentences are no different from those in 'active' sentences. There is then no promotion of object to subject, no intransivization of the verb, and no change in the subcategorization of the agent. I would like to propose that there are no lexical passives in Chinese; rather than having each verb with many subcategorization frames, one for each type of 'passive', or having *bei* as a full verb (see below), we should see all verbs as active, and the 'passive subjects' as topics. In this way, Chinese would have no lexical passives, only configurational highlighting of the affectedness of the patient by the use of *bei*.

Other Analyses

The idea that Chinese does not have lexical passives is not new. Y. R. Chao (1968) said explicitly that Chinese verbs do not have a voicing distinction. But his explanation of passive-like sentences is quite different from the one presented here. He analyzes Chinese verbs as having 'direction ... outward from the subject as actor or inward towards the subject as goal' (p.702).[25] The *ba* and *bei* constructions then function to disambiguate direction outward or inward respectively. This analysis is only possible, though, because of Prof. Chao's analysis of 'subject' as whatever comes first in the sentence. My analysis of subject in Chinese is similar to that in Li & Thompson 1976, that '[t]here is simply no noun phrase in Mandarin sentences which has what E. L. Keenan [1976] has termed "subject properties"' (p.479). That is, Chinese is what Foley & Van Valin (1977) refer to as a 'role dominated' language where 'the organization of clause level grammar is controlled by semantic roles and their interactions' (p.298). In this type of language there is no grammatical function of 'subject' beyond semantic role.[26]

The previous analysis that is closest to mine is that of Mantaro J. Hashimoto 1968 (and also Anne Y. Hashimoto 1971), where the *bei* construction is seen as an 'inflictive' construction rather than a passive construction, and is formed by embedding an active sentence into a matrix sentence with the structure NP(SUBJECTIVE) + bei(VERB) + S(COMPLEMENT) (p.66). The condition on this embedding is 'that a nonsubject NP in the embedded sentence must be identical with the subject NP of the Matrix sentence' (p.68). Hashimoto also refers to the pre-bei NP as a 'topic phrase' (p. 68), I assume vis à vis the main verb, but he marks *bei* as a verb. It is difficult to determine what the actual status of *bei* is; I do not feel it is still a verb, but I also do not consider it a complete syntacticization in the sense of Comrie 1988.   Comrie makes a distinction between 'grammatical encoding' and

---

[25]The less radical applications of this concept were further developed in Li 1981.

[26]I will not go into detail on this point here, but will deal with the whole question of 'subject' in Chinese in a later paper.

'syntacticization'. Grammatical encoding is '... the formal encoding of a given pragmatic or semantic distinction, with no implication of departure from the strict semantic or pragmatic definition of that distinction. Syntacticization refers to a syntactic distinction that cannot be reduced to semantics, pragmatics, or a combination thereof.' (p.4). The *bei* sentence then seems to be an example of grammatical encoding as defined by Comrie.

Within the LFG framework, two other attempts have been made to analyse *bei* sentences, both of which subcategorize *bei* as a verb. The first one, Ma (1985), is dealt with in Tan (1987), so I will concern myself only with Tan (1987).

In Tan's view, *bei* is a transitive verb with the argument structure in (30). She has the f-structure of sentence (31) (her 13b, p. 286, which she quotes from Ma 1985) then as in (32):

(30)   bei V 'affected by<(SUBJ),(OBJ)/(SCOMP)>'

(31)   Laotan bei Malizi zai   ziji   de fangjianli da   le.
        Laotan bei Malizi loc. self poss room   beat ASP
        Laotan was beaten by Malizi in her room.

```
(32) | SUBJ          [PRED 'LAOTAN']                              |
     |                                                            |
     | ADJ           |SUBJ [ ---- ]                          | |
     |               |OBJ   [PRED 'MALIZI']                  | |
     |               |ADJ   |SUBJ [ ---- ]            | | |
     |               |      |PRED       ['IN SELF'S ROOM<SUBJ>'] | | |
     |               |PRED        'AFFECTED BY< (SUBJ)(OBJ)>'  | |
     |                                                            |
     | PRED '        WAS BEATEN<(SUBJ)>'                    |
```

Tan's view is that '...the difference between *bei* sentences and their counterparts without *bei* phrases is not analogous to that between passive and active sentences in English -- A *bei* phrase serves as adjunct to the matrix predicates, which are unspecified for voice, and makes the meaning more specific...' (p.293) According to Tan, this adjunct can be removed from the sentence without changing its meaning. This is simply not the case. The examples she gives are both of the type where the pre-*bei* NP would not logically be the subject of the verb, so there is no problem with ambiguity when the *bei*-phrase is removed. They then are of the first type of apparent passive I described above (her 32a and 32b, p.291 and 292), not typical *bei* constructions minus the *bei*-phrase:

(33a) laoshi jiao le toufa.   (33b) Lisi jiang   le gongzi.
       teacher cut ASP hair   Lisi cut-down ASP salary
       The teacher got his hair cut   Lisi had his salary cut.

In a *bei* structure where there could be serious ambiguity, the removal of the *bei*-phrase changes the entire meaning of the sentence, as I discussed earlier. For example, if we remove the *bei*-phrase from sentence (19), the result would be sentence (34):

(34)   muji   chi le yi zhi   xiao jir
        mother-hen eat ASP one CL little chick
        The mother hen ate one chick.

Another problem with this view is that in *bei* sentences without complements, the *bei*-phrase adjunct that is removable includes only *bei* and the agent, but where there is a complement, suddenly the matrix verb (the main action that the patient is undergoing) is part of the adjunct. For example, in sentence (8), Tan would have *bei Mary* as the adjunct, while in sentence (15), *bei Mary da* would be the adjunct, as it has the same NP-*bei*-NP-V-V structure as in sentence (26) (her (3), p.285). There would be no other way to show the functional control relationship between *John* and the subject of *si* 'to die'. For this reason, her theory cannot explain sentences (16), (19)-(22), etc, or the different interactions of the pre-*bei* NP with the two verbs in a sentence with an XCOMP. She would also have *xianglian* 'necklace' as the subject of *diao* "to lose' in (26), when it is actually the POSS of the *san ke zhuzi* 'three beads' (cf. sent. (19)).

In the case of (31), if what Tan is calling an adjunct is removed, the meaning of the sentence is drastically changed if *Laotan* is still the subject: 'Laotan hit'. In the quote given above, Tan says that the matrix predicates are 'unspecified for voice', yet in her f-structure she gives the translation and subcategorization frame of the matrix predicate as 'was beaten<(SUBJ)>', both clearly passive. Whether we give the verb a passive subcategorization frame or not, as there is no passive verbal morphology in Chinese, if *Laotan* is read as the subject, the sentence must mean that it was *Laotan* who did the hitting, not that he/she was the object of the hitting. Only if *Laotan* is read as a topic/object (with a pause after it) can the sentence be said to have a passive meaning.

Another weakness of Tan's approach is the complication of the lexicon. She says given her analysis, 'it should be specified that *bei* never appears as the matrix predicate unlike other transitive verbs, which can either be matrix predicates, or adjunct predicates ... ' (Tan 1987:294). This seems to be a very unnatural and unnecessary specification.

If we consider *bei* sentences as similar to topicalization, and *bei* itself as simply a sentential particle (there are many in Chinese), all of the 'passive' sentences given above are handled elegantly, and there is no need to complicate the lexicon.

REFERENCES

Baker, Mark. 1983. Objects, themes, and lexical rules in Italian. Papers in Lexical Functional Grammar, ed. by L. Levin, M. Rappaport & A. Zaenen. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Bresnan, Joan. 1982. The passive in lexical theory. The mental representation of grammatical relations, ed. by Joan Bresnan. Cambridge: MIT Press.

_____. 1987. On locative inversion in Chichewa. CSLI Monthly 2.8:1-6.

Bresnan, Joan, and Sam Mchombo. 1987. Topic, pronoun, and agreement in Chichewa. CSLI Report No. CSLI-87-78.

Bresnan, Joan, & Jonni M. Kanerva. 1988. Locative inversion in Chichewa: a case study of factorization in Grammar. ms. Stanford University.

Chao, Yuen Ren. 1968. A grammar of Spoken Chinese. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cheng, Chin-chuan. 1988. Huati benwei Hanyu pianzhang yufa (A discourse-topic based grammar of Chinese). Paper presented to the Seventh Workshop on Chinese Linguistics, Project on Linguistic Analysis, UC Berkeley, March 24-25, 1988.

Comrie, Bernard. 1988. Topics, grammaticalized topics, and subjects. BLS 14.

Foley, William A. & Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 1978. On the viability of the notion of 'subject' in universal grammar. BLS 4.293-320.

_____. 1984. Functional syntax and universal grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 1985. Information packaging in the clause. Language Typology and syntactic description, Vol. 1: Clause structure, ed. by T. Shopen, 282-364. Cambridge University Press.

Fox, Barbara. 1981. Body part syntax: towards a universal characterization. Studies in Language 5.3:323-342.

Hanson, Kristin. 1987. Topic constructions in Spoken French: some comparisons with Chichewa. BLS 13.105-116.

Hashimoto, Anne Y. 1971. Mandarin Syntactic Structures. Chi-Lin (Unicorn) 8:1-149.

Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1968. Observations on the passive construction. Chi-Lin (Unicorn) 5.59-71.

Hopper, Paul J. 1979. Aspect and foregrounding in Discourse. Discourse and syntax (Syntax and semantics, Vol. 12), ed. by Talmy Givón, 213-241. New York, San Francisco & London: Academic Press.

Hopper, Paul J. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. Language 56.251-299.

Huang, C.-T. James. 1984. On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. Linguistic Inquiry 15.4:531-574.

Keenan, Edward L. 1975. Some universals of passive in relational grammar. CLS 11.340-352.

_____. 1976. Towards a universal definition of 'subject'. Subject and topic, ed. by C. N. Li, 305-333. New York: Academic Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. & Pamela Munro. 1975. Passives and their meaning. Language 51.789-830.

Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1974. Chinese as a topic-prominent language. Paper presented to the 7th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Atlanta, Georgia, Oct. 18-19, 1974.

_____. 1976. Subject and Topic: a new typology of language. Subject and topic, ed. by C. N. Li, 459-489. New York: Academic Press.

_____. 1979. Third-person and zero-anaphora in Chinese discourse. Discourse and syntax (Syntax and semantics, Vol. 12), ed. by Talmy Givón, 311-335. New York, San Francisco & London: Academic Press.

_____. 1981. Mandarin Chinese: a functional reference grammar. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Li, Linding. 1986. Shoushi chengfen ju leixing bijiao (A comparison of sentence types with affected (object) elements). Zhongguo Yuwen 1986.5:341-352.

Li, Ying-che. 1981. 'Directionality' in Chinese syntax. Paper presented to the 14th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Gainesville, Florida, Oct. 30-Nov. 1, 1981.

Lü, Shuxiang. 1980. Xiandai Hanyu babai ci (Eight hundred words of Modern Chinese). Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan.

Ma, Lizi. 1985. The classical notion of passive and the Mandarin Chinese *bei.* ms. Stanford University. Quoted in Tan (1987).

Ma, Xiwen. 1987. Yu dongjieshi dongci youguan de mou xie jushi (Certain syntactic patterns associated with verb-result type verbs). Zhongguo Yuwen 1987.6:424-441.

Marantz, Alec P. 1984. On the nature of grammatical relations. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph Ten. The MIT Press: Cambridge, Mass.

McCawley, James D. 1988. Notes on Li and Thompson 1981. ms. University of Chicago.

Nichols, Johanna. 1986. Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar. Language 62.56-119.

Noonan, Michael & Edith Bavin Woock. 1978. The passive analog in Lango. BLS 4.128-139.

Perlmutter, David. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. BLS 4.157-189.

Perlmutter, David, and Paul Postal. 1977. Toward a universal characterization of passivization. BLS 3.394-417.

Peyraube, Alain. 1988. Notes on the history of the passive construction in Chinese up to the Tang dynasty (Xth c.). Paper presented to the Seventh Workshop on Chinese Linguistics, Project on Linguistic Analysis, UC Berkeley, March 24-25, 1988.

Sells, Peter. 1985. Lectures on contemporary syntactic theories: An introduction to G-B theory, GPSG, and LFG. CSLI Lecture Notes, No. 3.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. Passives and related constructions: a prototype analysis. Language 61.821-848.

Solnit, David. 1981. Locatives, Yao and Chinese. Paper presented to the 14th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Gainesville, Florida, Oct. 30-Nov. 1, 1981.

Tan, Fu. 1987. The predicate argument structure of *bei*. BLS 13. 285-295.

_____. 1988. Interaction among lexical rules in Chinese. ms. Stanford University.

Tao, Liang. 1986. Clause linkage and zero anaphora in Mandarin Chinese. Davis Working Papers in Linguistics 1.36-102.

Thompson, Sandra A. 1973. Transitivity and some problems with the *ba* construction in Mandarin Chinese. Journal of Chinese Linguistics 1.2:208-221

Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 1977. Ergativity and the universality of subjects. CLS 13.689-705.

_____. 1987. Aspects of the interaction of syntax and pragmatics: discourse coreference mechanisms and the typology of grammatical systems. The Pragmatic perspective: Selected papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference (Pragmatics & beyond companion series, Vol. 5), ed. by Jef Verschueren & Marcella Bertuccelli-Papi, 513-531. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

_____. 1988. Semantic parameters of unaccusativity. ms. UC Berkeley/Davis.

Yang, Lucia. 1980. The subject in transitive sentences in Chinese. Paper presented to the 13th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, University of Virginia, Charlotsville, Oct. 24-26, 1980.

Zhu, Dexi. 1979. Hanyu jufa li de qiyi xianxiang (Ambiguity in Chinese syntax). Paper presented to the 12th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Paris, Oct. 19-21, 1979.