Complementation within the Bei Construction in Mandarin Chinese

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2017-10-03 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 斉木, 麻利子 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2297/432

Complementation within the *Bei* Construction in Mandarin Chinese*

Mariko SAIKI

I. Introduction

One finds in Mandarin Chinese constructions incorporating the word *bei*. These are most often likened to passive constructions in Western languages. Indeed, there is a prima facie resemblance between the *bei* construction, and, to pick the best-known example, the English passive voice. Paraphrase relations like that found in (1) constitute one of the principle features of the English passive, and linguists have pointed out that a highly similar relationship, typified by (2), holds among Chinese sentences.[1]

(1) Mary hit John.=John was hit by Mary.

(2) Mary da le. John=John *bei* Mary da le.
hit ASP BEI hit ASP
'Mary hit John.' 'John was hit by Mary.'

While the English and Chinese constructions may resemble each other in a superficial way, the underlying syntactic mechanisms that ensure these paraphrase relations are demonstrably quite different. It is my goal in this paper to draw attention to some of these fundamental syntactic differences. In the theoretical framework of the *Lexical-Functional Grammar* (Bresnan ed. 1982, Dalrymple, Kaplan, Maxwell III and Zaenen eds. 1995), researchers have provided a description of the passive in English and many other languages ; I shall call such structures the classical passive. In the following sections, I shall show that the *bei* construction cannot be viewed as a classical passive, and argue for an alternative analysis that portrays *bei* as a complementation structure.

II. Preliminaries

Sentences in Mandarin Chinese (henceforth Chinese) incorporating the word *bei* have been identified as having a surface constituent order like that in (3), where NP1 and NP2 are in most usual cases *theme* and *agent* noun phrases respectively.

平成10年9月11日受理

(3) NP1 *bei* (NP2) V

In simple cases, it is possible to find sentences in the active voice that correspond to *bei* sentences. The object of the active sentence assumes the structural position of the subject in its *bei* counterpart, and the subject of the active sentence seems to be demoted, as shown in the following pairs of sentences.

(4) a. Ma Lizi kan-jian le Lao Tan.
see ASP
'Ma Lizi saw Lao-Tan.'

b. Lao-Tan *bei* Ma Lizi kan-jian le.
BEI see ASP
'Lao-Tan was seen by Ma Lizi.'

(5) a. Ta faxian le nei jian shi.
s/he discover ASP that NC thing
'S/he discovered that.'

b. Nei jian shi *bei* ta faxian le.
that NC thing BEI s/he discover ASP
'That was discovered by her/him.' (Li and Thompson 1981, slightly modified)

In (4) and (5), (b) sentences are the *bei* counterparts of the corresponding (a) sentences. In addition, NP2 in (3.b) is optional as example (6) shows.

(6) Nei jian shi yijiouerba-nian *bei* faxian le.
that NC thing 1928-year BEI discover ASP
'That was discovered in 1928.'

From the observations above, it is not difficult to see why researchers like Siewierska (1984) have been tempted to analyze the *bei* construction as an instance of the classical passive.

In the theoretical framework of *Lexical*-Functional Grammar (LFG ; Bresnan ed. 1982, Dalrymple, Kaplan, Maxwell III and Zaenen eds. 1985), Bresnan (1982a) provided a universal description of passivization in terms of the lexical rule in (7).[2] This approach abstracts away from parochial structural characteristics of individual languages to expose the common element which links passives cross-linguistically.

(7) $\begin{cases} (\text{SUBJ}) \mid \rightarrow \phi/(\text{OBL}_{agent}) \\ (\text{OBJ}) \mid \rightarrow (\text{SUBJ}) \end{cases}$

The lexical rule in (7) applies to the *lexical form* (LF)[3] in (8.a) within the lexicon (along with whatever language particular morphological processes are appropriate), and in effect derives the passive LF in (8.b).

(8) a. LF < (SUBJ) (OBJ) >
AGENT THEME

b. LF < (SUBJ) > (OBL*agent*)
THEME AGENT

Chinese employs the constituent structure for marking non-oblique grammatical functions like subject and object.[4] Hence, the permutation of arguments which takes place between the (a) and (b) sentences in (4) and (5) is consistent with the lexical rule in (7). Furthermore, this lexical rule accounts for the usual characteristic of the passive demonstrated by example (6), that is, the characteristic of not displaying an overt agent noun phrase.

Based on the nature of passivization captured by the lexical rule in (7), it is possible to explore the empirical consequences of supposing that *bei* sentences are classical passive. In the following sections, I shall show that the hypothesis underlying this lexical rule fails to predict many facts about the *bei* construction. I shall also argue that an alternative approach, which assumes that *bei* takes an open complement, overcomes this difficulty.

III. Viewing *bei* Sentences as Classical Passives

This section examines a couple of predictions that associating *bei* with passivization entails.

1. Is NP2 an Oblique?

One objection that can be raised to the hypothesis that *bei* is a passive marker relates to the form of NP2 in the schema in (3). This NP occurs without any preposition or postposition. This seems rather anomalous, since the characterization of classical passive would predict that this NP is an instance of an oblique NP. Viewing Chinese as a whole, obliques are usually accompanied by a pre-or postpositional marker, contrary to the situation that we find in (4) and (5).

A more damaging argument comes from the fact about the placement of the NP representing the agent argument within *bei* sentences. This NP must follow the word *bei*. In Chinese, one of the preferred locations for oblique arguments is that immediately after the subject. The argument that we labeled NP2 in (3) cannot occur in this position, as (9) shows.

(9) *Lao-Tan Ma Lizi *bei* kan-jian le.

A possible solution to the above problems would be to suppose that *bei* is not an auxiliary verb, but in fact a prepositional marker for oblique agents. However, a much more severe problem remains for the passive analysis, as we shall see below.

2. Existence of an Extra NP within a *bei* Sentence

The lexical rule in (7) captures the semantic correspondence between the subject of the active sentence and the oblique argument in the passive sentence. It also explains that the object of the active sentence is semantically related to the subject of the corresponding passive sentence. Hence, only two arguments are permitted to occur within the passive LF that is derived by this lexical rule. However, similar to the Japanese indirect passive construction, the Chinese *bei* construction allows three NPs co-occurring with a transitive verb. This point is illustrated in (10). Compare (10) with (11), which is an instance of the Japanese indirect passive construction. Notice, also, that the underlined NP *toufa* 'hair' in (10) is not specified of its presence on the schema in (3).

(10) Lao Tan *bei* Ma Lizi liao le <u>toufa</u> le.
BEI cut ASP hair ASP
'Lao-Tan had Ma Lizi cut her (Lao-Tan's) hair.'[5]

(11) Takashi-wa doroboo-ni jitensya-o nusum-are-ta.
Takashi -TOP thief-by bicycle-ACC steal-PASS-PAST
'Takashi had his bicycle stolen by a thief.'

Obviously, if we continue to assume that the *bei* constructions are classical passives, we will be forced to make significant changes to the universal characterization of passivization embodied in the lexical form in (7).

IV. The *bei* Construction and the Complementation Approach

It was briefly noted in the previous section that the Mandarin Chinese *bei* construction syntactically resembles the Japanese indirect passive. This observation might guide us toward a more satisfying treatment of the Chinese *bei*. In this section, I shall argue for the possibility of applying an existing analysis of the Japanese indirect passive to the *bei* construction in Chinese.

1. Ishikawa's (1985) Analysis of the Indirect Passive Construction in Japanese

Ishikawa (1985) notes that the Japanese passive morpheme *-(r)are* may occur in two semantic contexts. One is that of a *direct passive*, which does not bear any special connotations. The other, i.e., the *indirect passive*, however, conveys the idea that the subject of the sentence indirectly suffers from the action described by the verb stem. (12) and (13) below contain examples of direct passive and indirect passive, respectively.

(12) Takashi-ga Reiko-ni but-are-ta.
Takashi-NOM Reiko-by hit-PASS-PAST
'Takashi was hit by Reiko.'

(13) Takashi-ga Reiko-ni otooto-o but-are-ta.
Takashi-NOM Reiko-by brother-ACC hit-PASS-PAST
'Takashi had Reiko hit his brother.'

Note that in (12) the subject *Takashi* is directly affected by the action denoted by the verb *but-* 'to hit', while in (13) it is not. This is the reason why passive sentences in (12) and (13) are called the direct and the indirect passives, respectively. Moreover, (12) is semantically neutral. It only describes the event where Takashi was the 'hittee' and Reiko was the hitter. However, the sentence in (13) contains an adversative connotation posed on the part of the subject. What this sentence means is that Takashi was adversely affected by the event in which Reiko hit his brother. For this reason, this usage of *-(r)are* is sometimes termed the *adversity passive* (Kuno 1976).

Ishikawa (1985) isolates the syntactic and semantic differences between the direct and the indirect passives in Japanese by positing two homophonous passive morphemes *-(r)are*. According to Ishikawa, the direct passive in Japanese is derived through the lexical rule in (7) together with the affixation of one kind of *-(r)are* to the verb stem. Moreover, he provides the lexical entry in (14) for the other kind of *-(r)are*, which in turn constitutes the main predicate of the indirect passive in Japanese.

(14) *-(r)are* V : ⟨(↑ SUBJ) (↑ OBJ2) (↑ XCOMP)⟩ (↑ OBJ)
(↑ XCOMP SUBJ)=(↑ OBJ2)

The argument on the far right (↑ OBJ) in (14) is required for Ishikawa's rule of *object function sharing*, which accounts for certain Japanese case marking problems. What is most important from our present perspective is the usage of the open complement or XCOMP.

LFG assigns the grammatical function XCOMP to a complement that predicates something of

another argument within the sentence. This kind of complement is characterized in LFG as open in that it lacks a logical subject within. However, the logical subject is identified in LFG by means of the mechanism of *functional control* (Bresnan 1982b). Functional control assumes a control relation between the subject of the XCOMP as a controllee, and some other argument within the sentence as a controller. Furthermore, the lexical entry of a verb specifies the controller of the subject of a given XCOMP by means of a functional equation. Thus, the functional equation on the second line of (14) functionally identifies the controller of the subject of the open complement as equivalent to the second object of the sentence.

It is important to notice that the analysis of the Japanese indirect passive construction outlined above does not restrict the number of NPs to two within a single sentence. Hence, the occurrence of the NP *jitensya-o* 'bicycle-ACC' in (13) is easily accounted for by this analysis, although this NP is considered extra in reference to the universal characterization of classical passive.

2. Semantics of the *bei* Construction

It has been reported that Chinese *bei* sentences semantically carry implications of adversity (Li and Thompson 1981, Teng 1975). While citing (Li 1969), Teng (1975) claims that Chinese passives are generally associated with the feature pejorative. This analysis reflects how the surface subject is viewed by the speaker. Thus, for example, (4.b) expresses how the referent of the surface subject *Lao*-Tan is viewed through the subjective rendering of the event on the part of the speaker. In addition, this sentence carries an implication that unfortunately, Lao-Tan was seen by Ma Lizi, or, Lao-Tan should not have been seen by Ma Lizi. Note that the meaning of *kan*-jian 'to see' in (4.a) is totally neutral, i.e. without any pejorative connotation, as the verbs of perception in general are. Hence, the pejorative or adversative connotation in *bei* sentences is brought forth not by the lexical property of the verbs (Chao 1968), but by a structural property of the *bei* construction in Chinese.

Kierman (1972), however, notes that in Modern China, the non-adversative usage of *bei* sentences is increasing. He conjectures that this is due to the influence of Indo-European languages, especially Russian, which have provided vast numbers of political material. Thus, the following example, which is from Li and Thompson (1981), is grammatical despite the absence of adversity connotation.

(15) Sheng cheng *bei* jiefang le.
province capital BEI liberate ASP
'The provincial capital has been liberated.' (Li and Thompson 1981)

In addition, in the writings on political issues, we find numerous examples of *bei* sentences, such

as (16) and (17), which lack adversative meaning.

(16) Youyong *bei* dangdi de haizimen renwei shi yi ge
swimming BEI place in question POSS children consider be one NC
bikeshaode yundong.
indispensable exercise
'Swimming is considered to be an indispensable sport by the children there.'
(Lu 1980)

(17) Tamen *bei* bing chengwei dangdai liang da zuojia.
they BEI next to each other consider the age two big writer
'They are considered to be the best two writers of the age.' (Kuraishi 1982)

What, then, is the factor which determines the presence or non-presence of the pejorative or adversity reading within a given *bei* sentence? I do not propose the answer to this question in the confines of this paper. However, given Kiermans observation that the non-adversative usage of *bei* is a quite recent development, I assume that the adversative connotation is part of the inherent semantic property possessed by the *bei* construction in Chinese.

Now, let us notice that the semantic property of the *bei* construction mentioned above is shared by the indirect passive construction. More precisely, both the *bei* sentence in Chinese and the indirect passive construction in Japanese express an adversative effect on the part of their subjects. Moreover, as we pointed out briefly in section I.2, these two constructions possess the same syntactic property as well, i.e. the possibility of having an additional NP in reference to the classical passive.

Thus, nothing so far seems to prevent us from likening the Chinese *bei* construction to the Japanese indirect passive construction in the form analyzed by Ishikawa (1985).

V. Arguments for a Complementation Approach to the *bei* Construction

Let us hypothesize that *bei* is in fact a verb, and that the Chinese *bei* construction involves a complementation structure similar to the Japanese indirect passive construction. Then the possibility arises in which we could apply Ishikawa's analysis (1985) of the Japanese indirect passive construction to the Chinese *bei* construction, probably with some modification. In such a case, *bei* should be considered to subcategorize for an open complement or an XCOMP. In addition, the arguments on the schema in (3) should be syntactically characterized in the following way : NP1 is the subject of *bei* ; *bei* is the predicate of the whole structure ; NP2 is the object of *bei* as well as the controller of the subject of the open complement ; and V is the predicate of *bei*'s complement.

1. Problems Solved

Section II.2 discussed certain syntactic aspects of the *bei* construction that seem rather anomalous on the assumption that *bei* marks the classical passive. The current section, however, shows that these facts are quite consistent with our new hypothesis that portrays the *bei* construction as a complementation structure.

We first noted in section II.2 that NP2 in (3) does not occur with a preposition, unlike most oblique NPs in Chinese. It has been claimed in the relevant literature that universal grammar severely constrains the grammatical functions that the controller may bear within the control structure. Bresnan (1982b) argues that the controller NP must be a subject (SUBJ), object (OBJ), or second object (OBJ2). Then, since we are positing a control structure for the *bei* construction, the controller, NP2 in schema (3), must be either an object or a second object. Note that in Chinese both of these functions are syntactically expressed by an NP. Hence, the observation that NP2 does not have a pre-or postposition typical of obliques is consistent with the assumption that it is a non-oblique controller.

Moreover, in section II.2, we noted the valency changing property of *bei* passivization. However, the complementation analysis places no limit on the predicate argument structure of the complement's verb. In other words, on the present analysis, one would expect to find in a *bei* sentence NPs representing all the arguments of the complement's verb. Thus, the existence of extra NP in reference to the scheme in (3) within a *bei* sentence does not pose any problem to the complementation hypothesis, where the NP *toufa* 'hair' in (11) is easily identified as an argument occurring inside *bei*'s complement.[6]

2. Subjecthood of NP2

In this section, I shall discuss data that show that the NP labeled NP2 in (3) exhibits the behavior typical of a subject in Mandarin Chinese. In this fashion, I shall demonstrate the relevancy of the complementation approach to the treatment *bei*. In a control relationship, Bresnan (1982b) hypothesizes that the controllee must always be a subject. Hence, demonstrating the subjecthood of NP2 strongly supports our complementation hypothesis for the analysis of the *bei* construction.

2.1. Evidence from Adverbial Modification

Simpson (1994) states that in Warlpiri, there is a class of nominals that are used as manner adverbials. According to Simpson, these manner nominals only predicate the manner of the subject of a sentence. Moreover, she assumes that they are argument-taking predicates the subjects of which are controlled by the subjects of the whole sentences.

Among Chinese manner adverbials, we find *jing-jjng-de* 'quietly', *kuai-kuai-de* 'rapidly', *ganjing-de* 'neatly', *gaoxing-de* 'happily', etc., which are derived from the corresponding adjectives by the affixation of the morpheme *-de*. We also find adverbials in Chinese, which are formed by the affixation of the progressive aspect marker-*zhe* to a verb stem. In this group, we have *guang-zhe-jiao* 'barefooted', *chuan-zhe-qi* 'panting', *xiao-zhe* 'smilingly' and so on.

Similar to Warlpiri manner nominals (adverbials) discussed in Simpson (1994), the Chinese adverbials mentioned above only predicate the manner of the subject NP within a sentence. Observe in (18.a), how the adverbial *hulihutu-de* 'stupidly' describes how the subject *Lao-Tan* performed the action denoted by the verb, but it can never be interpreted as predicating the manner of the object NP *Ma Lizi*.

(18) a. Lao-Tan hulihutu-de da le Ma Lizi.
stupidly hit ASP
'Lao-Tan stupidly hit Ma Lizi.'

b. Lao-Tan da le Ma Lizi hulihutu-de.

In (18.b), the adverbial *hulihutu*-de 'stupidly' is placed just after the object NP in an attempt to force the object control reading. However, even under such a condition, the adverbial does not predicate the object.

The above facts about the Chinese manner adverbials are explained in LFG by assuming an open adjunct or XADJ (UNCT) as well as a control relation between the subject of the sentence and the subject of the open adjunct. Bresnan (1982b) notes that languages differ with respect to the set of grammatical functions that the controller of an open adjunct may assume. Thus, given the observation that Chinese manner adverbials are used predicatively, they are easily identified as open adjuncts. Also, given the fact that a Chinese manner adverbial only predicates the manner of the subject, the subject of the open adjunct is identified as the subject argument(s) within a sentence. Hence, we can determine the subjecthood of a given NP in Chinese by observing whether or not it controls the subject of a manner adverbial.

There are two structural positions for manner adverbials to occur within *bei* sentences: the position immediately following NP1 and that immediately following NP2, in reference to the schema in (3). Consider the following data.

(19) a. Lao-Tan guang-zhe-jiao *bei* Ma Lizi ti-si le.
barefoot BEI kick-die ASP
'Lao-Tan, who was barefoot, was kicked to death by Ma Lizi.'

b. Lao-Tan *bei* Ma Lizi guang-zhe-jiao ti-si le.
BEI barefoot kick-die ASP
'Lao-Tan was kicked to death by Ma Lizi, who was barefoot.'

(20) a. Lao-Tan hulihutu-de *bei* Ma Lizi na le xuduo dongxi.
stupldly BEI take ASP many thing
'Lao-Tan stupidly had many things taken away by Ma Lizi.'

b. Lao-Tan *bei* Ma Lizi hulihutu-de na le xuduo dongxi.
BEI stupidly take ASP many thing
'Lao-Tan was robbed of many things by stupid Ma Lizi.'

Notice, in (19a) and (20a), when the manner adverbials immediately follow NP1, their subjects are controlled by NP1. Also, (19.b) and (20.b) illustrate that when the manner adverbials occur immediately following NP2, they are controlled by NP2.

The above facts about Chinese manner adverbials within *bei* sentences are presented in Hashimoto (1971). Based on these facts, she introduces a transformational analysis of the *bei* construction where she posits an embedding deep structure.

For our current purpose, these facts clearly show that NP2 in (3) is a subject, just as the complementation analysis predicts. Quite contrary to the facts we have examined, the classical passive analysis of Chinese passives would identify this NP as an oblique, thus excluding the possibility of allowing manner adverbials to predicate the NP immediately following *bei*.

Furthermore, according to Hashimoto (1971), similar facts are obtained in what is referred to as the *pivotal construction*. Hashimoto shows that the pivotal construction in Chinese involves a complementation structure, where the matrix object controls the subject of the complement. Consider the two sentences in (21), which are instances of this construction, and notice, in both sentences, the matrix object *Li Si* is semantically interpreted as the subject of the verb *chi* 'eat'.

(21) a. Zhang San momo-de kan-zhe Li Si chi fan.
silently watch-PROG eat rice
'Zhang San silently watched Li Si eat.' (Hashimoto 1971)

b. Zhang San kan-zhe Li Si momo-de chi fan.
watch-PROG silently eat rice
'Zhang San watched Li Si eat silently.' (Hashimoto 1971)

Furthermore, in (21.a), the adverbial *momo-de* 'silently' is placed in the position immediately following the matrix subject *Zhang San*, and it describes the manner in which Zhang San

watched Li Si eat. However, if the same adverbial occurs immediately following *Li Si*, as in (21.b), it describes the manner in which Li Si ate.

Thus, given the above parallelism between the *bei* construction and the pivotal construction, it is obvious that, just like pivotal construction, the Chinese *bei* construction involves complementation, with NP2 in (3) being simultaneously an object and a subject.

2.2. Evidence from Reflexive Binding

Bresnan, Halvorsen and Maling (1985) introduce the following binary features in order to characterize pronominals (and anaphors) occurring cross-linguistically: [±subjective], [±nucleus] and [±logophoric]. Among them, [±subjective] designates whether or not a given pronominal is anaphorically bound by the subject argument of a sentence.[7]

It has been observed that the Chinese reflexive *ziji* 'self' refers to the subject (Li and Thompson 1981, Wang and Stillings 1983).[8] The following data confirm that *ziji* has the binding feature [+subjective] in Bresnan, Halvorsen and Maling's (1985) theory of anaphora.

(22) Lao-Tan$_i$ hen xihuan ziji$_i$.
very like self
'Lao-Tan likes herself.

(23) Lao -Tan$_i$ zai ziji$_{i/*j}$ de fangjian-li da le Ma Lizi$_j$ san-ci.
at self POSS room-inside hit ASP three-times
'Lao-Tan hit Ma Lizi three times in her (=Lao-Tan's) room

(24) Lao-Tan$_i$ gei Ma Lizi$_j$ ziji$_{i/*j}$ de shangpian.
give self POSS picture
'Lao-Tan gives Ma Lizi pictures of her (=Lao-Tan).'

(25) Lao-Tan$_i$ yiwei Ma Lizi$_j$ hen xihuan ziji$_{i/j}$.
think very much like self
'Lao-Tan thinks Ma Lizi likes her/herself.'

(26) Lao-Tan$_i$ qing Ma Lizi$_j$ da ziji$_{i/j}$.
ask hit self
'Lao-Tan asks Ma Lizi to hit her/herself.'

(27) Lao-Tan$_i$ rang Ma Lizi$_j$ da ziji$_{i/j}$.
let hit self
'Lao-Tan lets Ma Lizi hit her/herself.'

Examples (23) and (24) illustrate that *ziji* cannot be co-referential with an object or an indirect object, respectively. (25) shows that *ziji* can refer to either the matrix subject or the embedded subject. Hence, *ziji* reference is not clause bound. In (26) and (27), the interpretation of *ziji* is also ambiguous, because in both sentences *ziji* can choose as its antecedent the matrix subject or the matrix object. Note that these two sentences involve a complementation structure, where the matrix object controls the subject of the complement.

Now let us observe how the Chinese reflexive *ziji* behaves within *bei* sentences.

(28) Lao-Tan $_i$ *bei* Ma Lizi $_j$ zai ziji $_{i/j}$ de fangjian-li da le.
BEI in self POSS room-inside hit ASP
'Lao-Tan was hit by Ma Lizi in Lao-Tan's/ Ma Lizi's room.'

(29) Lao-Tan $_i$ *bei* Ma Lizi $_j$ gen ziji $_{i/j}$ de pengyou yiqi ti le.
BEI with self POSS friend together kick ASP
'Lao-Tan was kicked by Ma Lizi together with Lao -Tan's/ Ma Lizi's friend.(lit.)'

Notice that both (28) and (29) are ambiguous in meaning concerning the antecedent of *zjji*. Here, *ziji* can refer to either NP1 or NP2 in schema (3). This fact supports the analysis that NP2 has the subject function. Thus, given the [+subjective] property of the Chinese reflexive *ziji*, our conclusion should be that the Chinese *bei* construction contains an open complement the subject of which is functionally controlled by a matrix argument. This readily accounts for the status of NP2 in (3) as a binder of *ziji* : NP2 is a subject of an embedded complement. Furthermore, it is clear that Chinese *bei* sentences are not classical passives. If so, NP2 in (3) would have an OBL*agent* function, which does not qualify as a binder of *ziji*.

VI. Conclusion

In what precedes, I have argued that the *bei* construction in Chinese should not be analyzed in term of the traditional formulation of passivization that structurally relates an active sentence to a corresponding passive sentence. I have also presented evidence that supports an alternative approach which assumes a complementation structure underlying *bei* sentences. For this purpose, I have demonstrated that the NP immediately following the word *bei* within a *bei* sentence shares the same property with the subject in Chinese. However, I have not yet investigated the status of this NP as a matrix argument.[9] In addition, whether or not Ishikawa's (1985) complementation analysis of the Japanese indirect passive is applicable to the *bei* construction is still an open question. It is hoped that future research will thoroughly explicate these points for a complete description of the *bei* construction in Chinese.

Notes:

* This paper is in part based on the author's unpublished manuscript, Saiki (1986).

1. The abbreviations used for the English gloss throughout this paper are interpreted as follows:

ASP:	Perfective Aspect Marker	NC:	Numeral Classifier
TOP:	Topic Marker	ACC:	Accusative Case Marker
NOM:	Nominative Case Marker	PASS:	Passive Marker
PROG:	Progressive Aspect Marker	POSS:	Possessive Marker

2. See Bresnan and Kanerva (1989) for a more recent LFG analysis of the classical passive. They capture the universal phenomenon of passivization by means of the operation on the a(rgument)-structure of a verb.
3. A lexical form lists grammatical functions, which are assigned to each of the arguments on the predicate -argument structure of a verb.
4. There is no morphological case in Chinese, though the pre- and postpositions are employed in order to distinguish oblique arguments.
5. In (10), the possessor of *toufa* 'hair' is only interpreted as *Lao*-Tan. It is never interpreted as *Ma Lizi*. This fact is analogous to what is observed in the example of the Japanese indirect passive in (11), where a possessor-possessee relation is only interpreted to hold between the subject *Takashi* and *jitensya* 'bicycle'.
6. Unlike the Japanese indirect passive construction, the *bei* construction in fact does not allow intransitive verbs to occur in its complement. This is one of the targets of the author's future research.
7. [±nucleus] designates whether a given pronominal and its binder must co-occur within the same clause nucleus. Also, [±logophoric] characterizes a pronominal concerning its property to refer to, or not refer to the individual (other than a speaker) whose speech, thoughts, feelings, or general state of consciousness are reported or reflected (Clements 1975) within the sentence where it occurs.
8. *Ziji* 'self' in Chinese is used for all persons, numbers and genders.
9. Tan (1986) claims that the NP2 in schema (3) is not the matrix object of a *bei* sentence.

References:

Bresnan, J. ed. (1982) *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Bresnan, J. (1982a) "The Passive in the Lexical Theory," in J. Bresnan ed., *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Bresnan, J. (1982b) "Control and Complementation," in J. Bresnan ed., *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, also in *Linguistic Inquiry* 13 (3).

Bresnan, J., P.-K. Halvorsen and J. Maling (1985) "The Syntax of Bound Anaphora", MS. Stanford University and Xerox PARC.

Bresnan, J. and J. M. Kanerva (1989) "Locative Inversion in Chicheŵa: A Case Study of Factorization in Grammar", in *Linguistic Inquiry* 9 (3).

Chao, Y. R. (1968) *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA.

Clements, G. N. (1975) "The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse," in *Journal of West African Linguistics* X (2).

Darlymple, M., R. M. Kaplan, J. Maxwell III and A. Zaenen eds. (1995) *Formal Issues in Lexical-Functional Grammar*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA.

Hashimoto, A. Y. (1971) "Descriptive Adverbials and the Passive Construction," in *Unicorn* 7.

Ishikawa, A. (1985) *Complex Predicates and Lexical Operations in Japanese*, Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.

Kierman, F. A. (1972) "Night-thoughts on the Passive," in *Unicorn* 8.

Kuno, S. (1976) "Subject Raising," in *Japanese Generative Grammar, Syntax and Semantics* 5, in M. Shibatani ed., Academic Press, New York, San Francisco and London.

Kuraishi, T. (1982) *Nichuu-jiten* [Chinese-Japanese Dictionary] , Iwanami, Tokyo.

Li, T. (1983) "Topic-Binding and Control in Chinese," MS. Department of Linguistics, University of California at Los Angeles.

Li, Y. C. and S. Thompson (1981) *Mandarin Chinese : A Functional Reference Grammar*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA.

Lu, J. H.-T. (1980) *Xiandai Hanyu Babai Ci* [Eight-hundred Words in Modern Chinese] , Shangwuyinshuguan, Hong Kong.

Saiki, M. (1986) "The *Bei* Construction and Complementation in Mandarin Chinese," MS. Department of Linguistics, Stanford University.

Simpson, J. (1994) *Warlpiri Morpho-Syntax : A Lexicalist Analysis*, Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, vol. 23, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordorechit, Boston and London.

Swieraska, A. (1984) *The Passive: A Comparative Linguistic Analysis*, Croom Helm, London.

Tan, F. (1986) "The Predicate Argument Structure of *Bei*," MS. Department of Linguistics, Stanford University.

Teng, S. (1975) *A Semantic Study of Transitivity Relations in Chinese*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA.

Wang, J. and J. T. Stillings (1983) "Chinese Reflexives," MS. Department of Linguistics, Tianjin Normal University.