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Short Passives in Modern and Classical Chinese

Shengli Feng (馮勝利)
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*Beijing Language and Culture University*

While the long passive *bei*-sentences in Mandarin Chinese involve an A′-movement, the short passives, as argued in the paper, can be divided into two types of constructions: one is viewed as a lexical compound; while the other is viewed as a complex verb. From both synchronic and diachronic perspectives, it is further argued that if the chronology of emergence of the [bei VP] forms is taken into account, three types of operations ranging from morphology (the [bei-V] compound), to morphosyntax (the [[bei V] NP] generated by the verb complex via Verb Incorporation) and to phrasal syntax (the [bei V _] derived by NP-movement) are all observed in history and maintained in Mandarin Chinese. It is then concluded that while synchronic analyses should refer to historical facts, diachronic studies can just as effectively cast light on synchronic research.
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1. Introduction

In formal syntactic theory, passive constructions have been taken as fundamental syntactic processes involving NP-movement. According to Chomsky (1995), movements never occur unless the interactions of some principles or subtheories require it. Passivization, a case of NP-movement, is triggered by passive morphology and forced by case theory. But such kind of syntactic analysis is found difficult to apply to languages like Chinese, since there is simply no such passive morphology in Chinese as in English. For example:

(1) a. 在戰爭中張三被敵人炸掉了一條腿。
    Zài zhànzhēng zhōng Zhāngsān bèi dìng zhà-diào le yǐtiāo tūi.
    at war inside Zhangsan BEi enemy blown-off ASP one.CL leg
    ‘Zhangsan’s one leg was blown off by the enemy in the war.’

b. 張三被李四打了他好幾次。
    Zhāngsān bèi Lǐsì dǎ le tā hǎo-jǐ cì.
    Zhangsan BEI Lisi hit ASP him many-times.
    ‘Zhangsan was hit by Lisi many times.’
bei is traditionally called a passive marker and therefore the pattern of a full passive sentence in Modern Chinese is like the following.

(2) [NP₁ beî NP₂ V NP₃/pronoun]

NP₁, the subject of a passive, is the logical object, and NP₂ is the logical subject. Since a pronoun or an NP in the object position needs Case according to the Case-filter, the verbs in (1) must have the ability to assign Case to the object. Therefore the passive marker beî does not function like -en in English, which absorbs the accusative case and the subject theta role from the verb.

Furthermore, although a pronoun is allowed to appear in the object position as seen in (1b), the sentence becomes ungrammatical if the agent NP is absent:

(3) *張三被打了好幾次。
   *Zhāngsān běi ____ dǎ le tā hǎo-jǐ cì.
   Zhangsan beî ____ hit ASP himi good-many times
   Intended meaning: ‘Zhangsan was hit many times.’

However, the absence of the agent NP would not affect the grammaticality of (1a):

(4) 在戰爭中張三被炸掉了一條腿。
   Zài zhànzhēng zhōng Zhāngsān běi ____ zhà-diào le yītiáo tūi.
   in war inside Zhangsan beî ____ blown-off ASP one.CL leg
   ‘One of Zhangsan’s leg was blown off in the war.’

Why is the agent NP so crucial in licensing the object pronoun and why are object NPs not affected by the presence or absence of the agent? Bei sentences without the agent NP have been called Short Passive (Ting 1995, Huang 1999), hence the question is why pronouns should make any difference from NPs in the short passive construction.

In this paper, I argue that the synchronic problems may very well be resolved from a diachronic perspective. First, according to Feng (1998), there were three types of bei passive structures that developed one after the other in Chinese history. The [bei-V] compound passive is attested in Archaic Chinese (400 BC). The [bei VP] phrasal passive is attested during the Eastern Han (100 AD) and the [bei IP] full (long) passive is attested by the Late Han (200 AD) and further developed by the Six-dynasties (420-589 AD). These three stages of the developments of bei passives are historically related but structurally independent, and all of the three forms are kept in Modern Chinese.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides background from previous studies on short passives in Chinese. Section 3 supports the compound-analysis proposed
by McCawley (1992) from a historical perspective. Section 4 describes the origin of the three types of bei passive constructions in Chinese history. Section 5 argues for a Verb Incorporation (VI) analysis for the phrasal compounds, and §6 is a summary of this study.

2. Previous studies on short passive construction

The short passive has always been a problem in Chinese syntax. For example (taken from McCawley 1992).

(5) *我被____从身上偷了手錶。
   *Wǒ bèi ____ cóng shēnshàng tōu le shǒubiǎo.
   I BEI____ from body steal ASP watch
   ‘I had my watch stolen off my wrist.’

When the agent NP is absent, no prepositional phrases are allowed to be adjacent to the bei. To this problem, Cheng (1986) proposes a reanalysis rule, cited in (6) which seems to work very well for (5).

(6) [VP P + e + V] → [v P V] (Cheng 1986)

It states that in the domain of VP, a preposition (i.e., bei) which is followed by an empty NP is reanalyzed as part of a compound verb. In Cheng’s system the reanalysis is obligatory if the agent NP is empty. Cheng’s (6) would rule out sentences like (5) by designating that bei is not adjacent to the verb and thus cannot be compounded with the verb. It seems to be a perfect solution to the problems caused by (5). There are, unfortunately, grammatical sentences in which the bei is not followed by a verb when the agent NP is absent, as pointed out by McCawley (1992) and Ting (1995):

(7) a. 張三被秘密地逮捕了。
    Zhāngsān bèi mǐmí.de dàibǔ le.
    Zhangsan BEI secretly arrest ASP
    ‘Zhangsan was arrested secretly.’

b. 張三被殘忍地殺死了。
    Zhāngsān bèi cánrěn.de shā-sǐ le.
    Zhangsan BEI cruelly kill-die ASP
    ‘Zhangsan was killed cruelly.’
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Obviously, when the reanalysis rule successfully rules out the ungrammatical ones in (5), it also rules out the grammatical ones in (7). It should be noted, however, that the reanalysis rule given by Cheng has captured an important property of the short passive sentences, as we will see in §3.

There is another problem brought up by short passives to the A*-movement analysis proposed by Feng (1990, 1995) and supported in Chiu (1995), Ting (1995, 1996) and Cheng, Huang, Li & Tang (1996). The A*-movement analysis was originally motivated by long passive sentences like the following (Feng 1990):

(8) a. 張三,被人把他打死了。
    Zhāngsān, běi rén bā tā dǎsǐ le.
    ‘Zhangsan was killed by someone.’

b. 教室, 被老師派李四找人掃乾淨了。
    Jiàoshì, běi lǎoshī pài Lìsī zhǎo rén sāo-gānjìng tī le.
    ‘The classroom was sent Lisi to find someone to sweep-clean it.’

Feng (1990) argues that the bei-sentences in (8) involve an empty operator movement, taking the following structural analysis:

(9) 張三被我打死了。
    Zhāngsān bèi [yì OP [wǒ dǎ-le e]]

The operator OP is an EC and is semantically empty, therefore, [e] is in effect a free variable, assigned no value by its operator in the embedded clause. As a result, it violates the principle barring vacuous operators. To satisfy the requirements that each LF variable be assigned a value by an antecedent that A-binds it, [e] must be bound by an NP in the matrix subject position as in (10a):

(10) a. 張三被我打了。
    Zhāngsān [bèi [OP [wǒ dá le e]]]
    ‘Zhangsan was hit by me.’

b. * Zhāngsān [bèi [OP [wǒ da-le e]]]

Under this analysis, sentence (10b) can be readily ruled out, because [e] is bound
only by \( OP \), and is in effect a free variable, which must be ruled out. The advantage of this analysis is that it explains not only the grammaticality of long passives in Modern Chinese, but also those in Classical Chinese\(^1\) (see Wei 1994), as in (11).

(11) a. 墓上人…被石酒气充入鼻中。(Suoshenji 搜神記 19, ca. 363 AD)
Mù shàng rén… bèi Shí jiǔ qì chōng rù bǐ zhōng
tomb up man... BEI Shi alcohol smell penetrate enter nose inside
‘The men on the tomb...got penetrated by Shi’s alcoholic smell into their nose.’

b. (金丹)若被諸物犯之…(Baopuzi 抱朴子, Neipian 内篇, ca. 300 AD)
(Jīndān) ruò bèi zhūwù fàn zhī...
(Jindan) if BEI everything attack him...
‘If Jindan was attacked (him) by everything...’

A retained object (11a) and especially a resumptive pronoun (11b) were also found to appear in the object position of long passive sentences in Classical Chinese which is exactly what the \( A' \)-movement analysis predicts.

However, the \( A' \)-movement analysis suffers from the challenge of short passive sentences. First, why are the following sentences ungrammatical?

(12) *張三被打了他了。
*Zhāngsān bèi dǎ le tā le.
Zhangsan BEI hit ASP him ASP
Intended meaning: ‘Zhangsan was hit (him).’

There seems to be no reason for the \( A' \)-movement analysis to rule out the ungrammatical sentences, because the absence of the agent NP should not affect the structure for the Null Operator to move, if short passives are derived from the long form via deletion of the agent NP. In order to account for these sentences, Feng (1990), following Cheng (1986), proposes a reanalysis rule similar to (6) and claims that the \( vP[...bei X...] \) is reanalyzed as a compound. However, the reanalysis account, as seen before, is seriously challenged by the following examples (Ting 1995):

---

\(^1\) The term ‘Classical Chinese’ is used here as a cover term referring to the literary language in Archaic and Ancient Chinese. ‘Archaic Chinese’ refers to the language used before the Qin Dynasty (220-206 BC) and ‘Ancient Chinese’ refers to the language from the Han Dynasty (206 BC-220 AD) to the Tang Dynasty (618-907 AD).
(13) a. *張三被在公園打死了。
    *Zhāngsān bèi zài gōngyuán dā-sī le.
    ‘Zhangsan was hit to death in a park.’
    Intended meaning: ‘Zhangsan was hit to death in a park.’

b. 張三被秘密地打死了。
    Zhāngsān bèi mìmì de dā-sī le.
    ‘Zhangsan was hit to death secretly.’
    ‘Zhangsan was hit to death secretly.’

The question is: if bei must be reanalyzed with the next element, why can it be so in (13b) but not in (13a)? Obviously, the reanalysis approach cannot account for the difference between (13a) and (13b).

In order to explain why there are two entirely different syntactic derivations operating in bei sentences, Ting (1995) proposes that there are actually two separate beis. BEI-1 is a two place predicate, taking an infinitive clause as its internal argument and an NP as its external argument, hence giving rise to an A’-movement. But BEI-2 can only take a VP as its internal argument, hence an A-movement is involved.

The Two-BEI analysis avoids the problem caused by the Reanalysis Hypothesis (Cheng 1986, Feng 1990), because what must be said about the short passives like (13b) in terms of a reanalysis can now be attributed directly to the syntactic properties of the BEI-2. Since BEI-2 only takes a bare VP, only VP adverbials (13b) but not sentential adverbials (13a) are allowed (See Ting 1996 for detailed analyses).

While distinguishing two BEIs is really a correct solution, as can be seen in §5, the NP-movement analysis for short passives is not without problems as it stands. First, as Huang (1999) points out, the bei passives (both long and short) may contain a subject-oriented adverb like gùyì ‘intentionally’, which the bei passive in English does not allow. For example (taken from Huang 1999):

(14) a. 張三故意被打了。
    Zhāngsān gùyì bèi dǎ le.
    ‘Zhangsan intentionally got hit.’

b. 張三故意被李四打了。
    Zhāngsān gùyì bèi Lìsì dǎ le.
    ‘Zhangsan intentionally got hit by Lisi.’

c. *Zhāngsān was hit intentionally.’
This suggests that the subject is base-generated in place and receives an independent thematic role from bei. If this is so, the Theme object cannot undergo an NP-movement to the subject position, because the subject position is not dethematized.

Second and most importantly, it is difficult for an NP-movement analysis to account for the grammatical sentence properly, as seen in (4) and more in (15).

(15) a. 張三被咬掉了一隻手。
    Zhāngsān bèi yǎo-diào le yīzhī shǒu.
    ‘Zhangsan had one of his hands bitten off.’

b. 房頂被吹掉了一個角。
    Fángdǐng bèi chuī-diào le yīge jiǎo.
    ‘A corner of the roof was blown off.’

c. 傻人被他打頭。(Baiyujing 百喻經, ca. 500 AD)
    Yǔ rén bèi tā dǎ tóu.
    ‘The simpleton was hit (his head) by someone.’

d. 近者被截髮。(Luoyang Qielanjì 洛陽伽藍記, ca. 500 AD)
    Jì zhě bèi jié fà.
    ‘The intimate ones had their hair cut off.’

e. 龜被生揭其甲。(Lingbiao Luji 嶺表錄異, ca. 850 AD)
    Guī bèi shēng jiē qí jiǎ.
    ‘The turtle’s shell was taken off while it was still alive.’

In these sentences, a retained object can still appear in the object position. The above grammatical sentences therefore argue against an A-movement analysis as given in the standard theory that NP-movement is forced by the lack of Case.\(^2\) In fact, for whatever motivations that one can come up with to make the object NP (or part of it) to

\(^2\) Note that the retained object can probably be said to have an inherent Case not necessarily assigned by the verb. If this is so, why are the same sentences ungrammatical in English?  
*The roof was blown off a corner.
*Zhangsan was bombed off one leg in the war.
*Zhangsan was bitten off one hand.

As seen below, the difference between Chinese and English can be explained by the theory developed here.
move (or stay), the movement process must be optional and not obligatory, which obviously leads to a situation in which an NP-movement is not called for. In what follows I argue that an appropriate analysis for the short passives should not only account for synchronic examples, but also accommodate diachronic facts. This is particularly so in the study of bei passives because, as we will see later, the short passives were not only independent of the long passives, but also developed during several historical stages. Most importantly, each stage of their developments created an independent structure used in Modern Chinese. Therefore, without a historical perspective, it is hard to see the independence of the short form from the long one and difficult to capture the variety of short passives established in history which have endured until the present day.

3. [bei-V] as compounds

Although current syntactic analyses have adopted the A'-movement analysis for long passive bei sentences, there is no agreement upon the short passive sentences. The problems involved in various types of short passives can be summarized in examples given in (16):

(16) a. 张三被人秘密地逮捕了。
    Zhāngsān bèi rén mìmí.de dàibǔ le.
    ‘Zhangsan was secretly arrested by someone.’

    a'. 张三被____秘密地逮捕了。
    Zhāngsān bèi ____ mìmí.de dàibǔ le.
    ‘Zhangsan was secretly arrested.’

b. 张三被人秘密地把他杀害了。
    Zhāngsān bèi rén mìmí.de bā tā shāhài le.
    ‘Zhangsan was secretly murdered (him) by someone.’

b'. *张三,被____秘密地把他杀害了。
    * Zhāngsān bèi ____ mìmí.de bā tā shāhài le.
    Intended meaning: ‘Zhangsan was secretly murdered (him).’

---
3 Huang (1999) proposes an ‘NP-movement-plus-control analysis’ for the [NP bei V____] short passives and, as seen in below, diachronic facts also argue for the NP-movement in this type of bei sentences.
c. 張三被人把他打死了。
Zhāngsān bèi rén bā tā dǎ-sī le.
'Zhangsan was killed (him) by someone.'

c'. 張三被他打死。
*Zhāngsān bèi bā tā dǎ-sī le.
Intended meaning: 'Zhangsan was killed (him).'

c''. 張三被打死了他。
*Zhāngsān bèi dǎ-sī le tā.
Intended meaning: 'Zhangsan was killed (him).'

d. 那隻狗被人打掉了一條腿。
Nèizhī gǒu bèi rén dá-diào le yītiáo tūī.
'That dog had his one leg struck off by someone.'

d'. 那隻狗被打掉了一條腿。
Nèizhī gǒu bèi ài dá-diào le yītiáo tūī.
'That dog had his one leg struck off.'

d''. 那隻狗被活活地打掉了一條腿。
Nèizhī gǒu bèi huóhuó dǎ-diào le yītiáo tūī.
'That dog had his one leg struck off alive.'

The problems are: first, if [bei V] cannot take a resumptive pronoun (16c''), why can it take an NP (16d')? Second, why do the [bei ADV V] (16d'') and the [bei V] (16d') behave alike in taking an object NP, and why does the [bei ADV V] in (16b'') and the [bei V] in (16c'') act alike in rejecting a resumptive pronoun? All in all, why should the presence or absence of the agent NP make any difference to the acceptability of a bei sentence with a pronoun? As seen below, all these properties would naturally follow if the [bei V] and [bei ADV V] are analyzed as compounds.

McCawley (1992) argues that in short passives of Modern Chinese, bei is not an independent word but a part of a compound verb. First, he observes that the omission of the agent NP is not possible when anything intervenes between the bei and the V (see Li 1990:156), as seen in (17) (taken from McCawley 1992).
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(17) a. 張三被人在公園打了。
   Zhangsan bei ren zai gongyu'an da-si le.
   'Zhangsan was killed by someone in a park.'
   a'. * 張三被____在公園打了。
    * Zhangsan bei ____ zai gongyu'an da-si le.
     Intended meaning: 'Zhangsan was killed in a park.'

b. 我被他從身上偷了手錶。
   Wo bei ta cong shenshang tou le shoubiao.
   I BEI him from body steal watch
   'I had my watch stolen off my wrist by him.'
   b'. * 我被____從身上偷了手錶。
    * Wo bei ____ cong shenshang tou le shoubiao.
     Intended meaning: 'I had my watch stolen off my wrist.'

c. 那些人被李四都請來了。
   Neixie ren bei Lisi dou qinglai le.
   those people BEI Lisi all invite
   'Those people were all invited by Lisi.'
   c'. *那些人被都請來了。
    * Neixie ren bei dou qinglai le.
     Intended meaning: 'Those people were all invited.'

d. 我被八戒怎麼領導起來了？
   Wo bei Ba jie zenme ling dao qilai le?! 
   I BEI Bajie why lead start
   'Why I am starting to be led by Bajie?'
   d'. *我被____怎麼領導起來了？
    * Wo bei ____ zenme ling dao qilai le?! 
     Intended meaning: 'Why I am starting to be led?'

McCawley notes that the adverbial quantifier *dou 都* can appear before the V if the agent NP is present, but cannot do so if that NP is omitted. When the agent NP is absent, however, the following sentences are still grammatical even if there are interventions between the bei and the V, as seen in (7). McCawley argues that the items that can
separate *bei* from the verb are verb-modifiers, not *V*-modifiers, *S*-modifiers, or Verb-complements. According to McCawley, “the combination of modifier and modified constituent is of the same category as the modified constituent.” If this is so, it follows that the combination of a *V*-modifier with a *V* is still a *V* (and not a *V*’). Thus, *mīmī.de dāsī* in (7a) is a *V* and so is *mīmī.de shā* in (7b), given the assumption that *mīmī.de* and *cānrèn.de* are *V* modifiers, rather than *V*’ modifiers. If both *mīmī.de dāsī* and *cānrèn.de shā* are verbs, they are eligible for compounding with *bei*, whereas expressions of the other types do not combine with a *V* into any syntactic unit at all, let alone a *V*, and are thus not eligible for compounding with *bei*. This is shown in (18).

(18) a. \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{bei} \\
\text{Adv} \\
\text{mīmī.de} \\
\text{secretly} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{kīll} \\
\text{V}
\end{array} \]

b. \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{PP} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{cōng} \\
\text{bōdī} \\
\text{shān} \\
\text{shān} \\
\text{shī} \\
\text{shōu} \\
\text{shān} \\
\text{shān} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{tōu} \\
\text{shōu} \\
\text{bīāo} \\
\text{steal} \\
\text{watch} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{V}
\end{array} \]

The [bei-ADV-V] in (18a) is a compound, because the *bei* and the [ADV-V] belong to the same syntactic category, while the combination of *bei* with a *P* in (18b) would not result in any syntactic unit at all. This is why sentences given in (17a'-b') and (17c'-d') are all ungrammatical.

I will adopt McCawley’s hypothesis and provide further evidence for his analysis. Note that, given McCawley’s assumption, sentences such as 《zhāngsān bēi mīmī.de dābī le ‘Zhangsan was arrested secretly’ is in fact an [NP V] structure. No resumptive pronoun is therefore allowed to appear in the object position coindexed with the subject, because of an obvious violation of the Principle B of the Binding theory. This is exactly the case as we have seen before:

(19) a. 李四被警察偷偷地打了他一頓。
   Lìsì, bēi jīngchá tōutōu de dā le tā, yídùn.
   Lìsì BEI policeman secretly hit ASP him once
   ‘Lìsì was hit secretly by a policeman.’

b. *李四被 偷偷地打了他一頓。
   *Lìsì, bēi tōutōu.de dā le tā, yídùn.
   Lìsì BEI secretly hit ASP him once
   Intended meaning: ‘Lìsì was secretly hit (him).’
c. *李四被***打了他一頓。
    *Lǐsì bèi ***dǎ le tā yīduàn.
    Lǐsì BEI hit ASP him once
    Intended meaning: ‘Lisi was hit (him).’

Why is (19b) not grammatical while (19a) is? The different grammaticality status between (19a) and (19b) shows that the two structures [bei NP ADV V] and [bei ADV V] must be different. On the other hand, why are (19b) and (19c) both ungrammatical? The same grammaticality status between (19b) and (19c) shows that they must have identical structures. This will lead naturally to a conclusion that the [bei-ADV-V] must be a single compound verb like [bei V].

4. History of short passives

The history of bei passives in Classical Chinese also confirms the hypothesis that the [bei V] and [beǐ-ADV-V] are compounds. First, the [bei V] short passives originated from the [bei NP] structure (‘bei’ means ‘to receive’ or ‘to get’), for example:

(20) a. 天下被其利。(Mozi 墨子, Shangxian 尙賢, ca. 468-376 BC)
    Tiānxìà bèi(qí) qí lì.
    ‘The world got benefit from it.’

b. 身被三累。(Hanfeizi 韓非子 2.3.52, ca. 281-233 BC)
    shēn bèi sān lèi.
    body receive three trouble
    ‘You got three troubles.’

Through a reanalysis, i.e., [bei N] → [bei V], the N in [bei NP] changed into a V, giving rise to the [bei V] structure during the Warring States (475-221 BC) (See Peyraube 1996, Wang 1989, Wei 1994), as seen in (21).

(21) a. bèi lù ‘got killed’, ‘got a death penalty’ 被戮
b. bèi shāng ‘got wounded’, ‘got a wound’ 被傷
c. bèi rǔ ‘got insulted’, ‘got an insult’ 被辱
d. bèi qīn ‘got invaded’, ‘got an invasion’ 被侵
e. bèi xíng ‘got executed’, ‘got an execution’ 被刑
f. bèi fēn ‘got disrupted’, ‘got a disruption’ 被分
Although there is no argument against the category change from N to V in [bei NP] sentences, one fact seems not to have received enough attention in the literature, namely only disyllabic [bei X⁰] forms are possible for an interpretation as either a [bei N] or a [bei V], as seen in (21). (21) shows that all recognizable [bei V] forms prior to the Han Dynasty (221 BC-206 AD) are overwhelmingly disyllabic forms, which I will call the Archaic forms. Of course there were trisyllabic [bei σσ] forms before Han, however, these forms like (22) were more likely a [bei NP] rather than a [bei V], as argued by Wang (1980:425).⁴

(22) Pre-Qin (before 221 BC)
    厚者入刑罰，薄者被誅誅。(Mozi 墨子, Gui yi 龔義, ca. 468-376 BC)
    hòu zhě rù xíngfá, bó zhě bèi húchóu.
thick one enter punishment thin one get condemnation
    ‘The kind ones get into punishment and the mean ones get condemnation.’

(22) shows that the trisyllabic [bei σσ] is different from the disyllabic [bei σ] structure (21). The disyllabic complements of bei before Han are more likely to be NP and therefore are unlikely to be reinterpreted as a verb. However the change from [bei NP] to [bei VP] needs a proper environment in which a reanalysis of N as V could take place, i.e., an environment that could enable the next generation to have trigger experiences for generating a new grammar (see Lightfoot 1991). Obviously, only the disyllabic [bei σ] forms can serve this purpose, as indicated in (21). The contrast between (21) and (22) shows clearly that the transition from [bei NP] to [bei VP] proceeded from a disyllabic environment. That is:

(23) N → V / [bei __]σσ

The necessary disyllabic environment for this change therefore leads naturally to a conclusion that the new [bei V] structure was born as a Prosodic Word, given the theory of Prosodic Morphology of Classical Chinese developed in Feng (1997).

---

⁴ One may argue that bei xīnglù 被刑罰 ‘was executed’ is also found in Guànzǐ 管子 (Pre-Qin?). If bei xīnglù is a [bei V] structure in Shījì 史記, it should also be analyzed as a [bei V] in Guànzǐ. As a result, the [bei σσ] forms that are analyzed as [bei V] must date from before the Han. However, it is well known that Guànzǐ was not written by a single person at one period of time. Although the phrase bei xīnglù did appear in Guànzǐ, according to previous studies (see Luo 1981, Xie 1983, and many others), the Section in which bei xīnglù occurs (i.e., Chéngmǎnshù 乘馬數) was written by Han Scholars during the time of Emperor Wu and Zhao—exactly the same time that the Shījì was written. As a result, Chéngmǎnshù cannot be considered as a Pre-Qin text and bei xīnglù is therefore not a Pre-Qin language.
Furthermore, the fact that no adverbs can appear inside the [bei V] PrWds in Pre-Qin (221 BC) indicates that the [bei V] forms may have been lexicalized as a compound. This is shown in (24).

(24)  a. 被圍于趙 (Zhanguoce 戰國策, Qice 齊策, ca. 300 BC)
        bèi wéi yú Zhào
        ‘got surrounded by Zhao’

         b. *被必圍于趙
            *bèi bì wéi yú Zhào (*=not attested)
            Intended meaning: ‘got certainly surrounded by Zhao’

         c. *被未圍于趙
            *bèi wèi wéi yú Zhào (*=not attested)
            Intended meaning: ‘got not surrounded by Zhao’

If the Archaic short passives were born as PrWds and lexicalized as compounds, then it is not surprising that the modern short passives also inherit this property.5

Third, as seen before, a resumptive pronoun in Ancient Chinese is allowed to appear after the embedded verb co-occurring with an agent NP. For example:

(25)  a. （李子敖）被鳴鶴吞之 * (Soushenji 搜神記, ca. 363 AD)
        (Li Zí’ao) bèi míng hè tūn zhī.
        (Li Zí’ao) got chirping crane swallow him.
        ‘Li Zí’ao got swallowed (him) by a chirping crane.’

5 Note that, even if the [bei -V] forms in Archaic Chinese are compounds, it does not mean that after the Han the two elements in the compound cannot form a phrase. Hence, synchronically (at any particular time after the Qin) there may be both compounds and phrases that share the same surface form. However, the compounds are inherited from Archaic Chinese, and their counterpart phrases are created anew. As a result, it would be extremely difficult to identify whether a given form such as bèi hài 被害 ‘be harmed’ in Han is an (old) compound or a (new) phrase according to their non-analyzed surface form. In fact, it may be a compound in one environment (without an object) but a phrase in another (with an adverb). This situation is similar to that of Modern Chinese: it is difficult to decide whether guān-xīn ‘concern heart, to concern’ is a compound or a phrase without the kind of syntactic information available to the researcher (for example, guān-xīn is a compound when it takes an object, but it is a phrase in guān shēn.mé xīn ‘what on earth are you concerning about’). The point I am trying to make here is this: the [bei-V] compounds and the [bei VP] phrases can be distinguished clearly by their diachronic developments. Hence diachronic studies can reveal distinct syntactic structures that emerged one after another historically, which synchronized and overlapped later on, making it difficult (if not impossible) to distinguish them in some cases.
b. （天女）被池主見之。（_Soushenji_ 搜神記, ca. 363 AD)
(Tiān nǚ) bèi chí zhū jiàn zhī.
(Heaven woman) BEI pool-owner see them.
‘The Heaven fairies were seen (them) by the pool-owner.’

c. （金丹）若被諸物犯之。（_Baopuzi_ 拜朴子, _Neipian_ 內篇, ca. 300 AD)
(Jīndān) ruò bèi zhū wù fàn zhī...
(Jindan) if BEI everything attack it...
‘If Jindan was attacked (it) by everything...’

There is no sentence found with a structure of [NP₁ bei____ V proj]. Given the historical origin of the [bei-V] PrWD and compound, and given our analysis above, it is clear that the [bei V] sequence must be a verb compound, resulting in the ungrammatical structure: *[NP₁ [bei-V] v Proj]. The fact is that there were many sentences formed with a [NP₁ bei NP V proj] structure, but hardly any [NP₁ bei V proj] cases in the language.⁶ The non-existent *[NP₁ bei V proj] sentences strongly indicate that the bei and the

---

⁶ There is only a single exception among all the grammatical sentences in my data:

(i) 闷在什麼處，即被打之？（_Zutangji_ 詔堂集, 4. _Shitou Heshang_ 四・石頭和尚, ca. 10th century)
Guò zài shén me chù, jí bèi dā zhī.
wrong at what place then bei hit it
‘What was wrong, then (he) was hit?’

However, the zhī in this case may be used as a place holder, rather than a resumptive pronoun.

The reason is as follows: First, we cannot find zhī appearing in *[bèi dā zhī] ‘was hit “it”, but
only in a four-syllable environment: ([jíbèi] (dāzhī)]. Hence it is possible that zhī was used as a
place holder for filling up the four-syllable pattern. Second, the function of zhī in (i) parallels
the function of suō (an object clitic which is also licensed in the context of a null operator, see
Chiu 1995, Ting 1996) in the same environment:

(ii) a. 恐被所算（_Sanguo Yanyi_ 58 _三國演義_・第58回）
kōng bèi suō suān
afraid got SUO trick
‘afraid to be tricked’

b. 必被所侵（_Sanguo Yanyi_ 94 _三國演義_・第94回）
bí bèi suō qīn
definitely get SUO catch
‘(will) definitely be caught’

Both zhī之 and suō 所 are disallowed by the null operator movement in (i-ii), but both zhī and
suō did appear there. However, all of the environments in which they appear are four-syllable
environments, and we could not find examples of *[bèi suō V] or *[bèi V zhī]. This indicates
that it is the four-syllable environment (i.e., the prosody) that forces zhī and suō to appear,
making them function as a place holder.
following \( V \) must be a single predicate. This undoubtedly supports the analysis that \([bei V]\) is a compound, not only in Modern Chinese, but also in Classical Chinese.

Fourth, contrary to the case of resumptive pronoun, an NP is very commonly seen to occur after the \([bei-V]\) compound, as seen in (26) below.

\[(26)\]
\[\text{a. 行至雪山南畔，當被劫奪國策及諸救信。} \quad (\text{Dunhuang Bianwen 敦煌变文, 8-10}^{\text{th}} \text{c.})\]
\[(Wáng Dúānzhāng) \text{ xíng zhì xuě shān nán pàn,...} \]
(Wang Duanzhang) travel arrive snow mountain south side
dáng bèi jièduó guó cè jí zhū chì xīn.
immediately get seize credential and every imperial letter.
‘When Wang Duanzhang traveled to the south of the snow mountain,...
he got his credentials and every imperial letters seized.’

\[\text{b. 被損落一板齒。} \quad (\text{Dunhuang Bianwen 敦煌变文, 8-10}^{\text{th}} \text{century})\]
\[(Qín Gùyán) bēi sūn-lù yì bānchǐ.\]
(Qin Guyan) et harm-fall one incisor
‘Qin Guyan got his incisor knocked out.’

\[\text{c. 任奸終被變形儀。} \quad (\text{Dunhuang Bianwen 敦煌变文, 8-10}^{\text{th}} \text{century})\]
\[Rèn jiān zhōng bèi biàn xíng-yí.\]
indulge evil finally get change appearance-bearing
‘If one indulges evil, he will finally get his appearance and bearing changed.’

The non-existent \([\text{NP}_{i} [bei-V]_{y} zhī]\) and the commonly occurring \([\text{NP bei-V NP}]\) follow exactly what the theory predicts. That is, the \([bei-V]\) is a verb compound hence a pronoun is not allowed by Principle B of the Binding Theory, and since the NP would not be affected by the binding requirement, it is legitimate to appear in the object position.

Fifth, if the \([\text{NP bei V NP}]\) sentences are grammatical in Classical Chinese, the \([\text{NP bei ADV V NP}]\) structure should also turn out to be grammatical. This is because if \([bei-V]\) is a compound and thus does not reject the NP object, the \([bei ADV V]\) would act similarly in allowing an NP object because according to McCawley’s analysis we adopt here, the \([bei-ADV-V]\) is a verb compound as well. This, as seen in (27), is exactly the case.

\[(27)\]
\[\text{a. 龜被生揭其甲。} \quad (\text{Lingbiao Luyi 嶴表錄異, ca. 850 AD})\]
\[\text{Guī bèi shēng jiē qí jiǎ.}\]
turtle BEI lively take-off its shell
‘The turtle’s shell was taken off while it was still alive.’
b. (燕子) 横被强夺窟。(Dunhuang Bianwen 敦煌變文, 8-10th century)
(Yánzi) héng bèi qiǎng duó kū.
(swallow) flagrantly get forcibly seize nest
‘The swallow got his nest seized flagrantly and forcibly.’

Undoubtedly, shēng ‘alive’ and qiǎng ‘forcibly’ were V-modifiers in Ancient Chinese, hence the [bèi-shēng/qiǎng-V] is a legitimate verb compound. The theory predicts that if the [bèi-ADV-V] sequence is a legitimate compound, it can only take an NP, rather than a resumptive pronoun, as its object. The existent [bèi-ADV-V NP] and the non-existent *[NP; bèi-ADV-V pro] indicate, once again that the [bèi-ADV-V] in Classical Chinese must be a verb compound.7

5. Verb incorporation

So far we have seen that [bèi-V] and [bèi-ADV-V] are compounds in both Modern and Archaic Chinese. While the compound analysis has solved the V-adverbial and the resumptive pronoun problems, there are still questions difficult to answer.

First, if the [bèi-ADV-V] is on a par with the [bèi-V] compound such as bèi-bù ‘got arrested’ (28) in Modern Chinese, and bèi-wéi ‘got surrounded’ (24c) in Archaic, an immediate question is why the [bèi-V] compounds cannot take an adverb to form a [bèi-ADV-V] compound. For example:

(28) *張三被秘密地捕了。
*Zhāngsān bèi mìmì.de bǔ le.
Zhangsan BEI secretly arrest ASP
Intended meaning: ‘Zhangsan got arrested secretly.’

(24) c. *被未围于楚
*bèi wèi wéi yú Zhào (*=not attested)
Intended meaning: ‘got not surrounded by Zhao’

Bèi-bù in Modern Chinese and bèi-wéi in Archaic Chinese are compounds hence no intervention of adverbs is allowed between the bèi and the verb. If the [bèi-ADV-V]

---

7 There is a part-whole relation between the subject and the retained object and this relation can be captured by assuming that the subject of the bèi passive is an experiencer base-generated on the Spec of IP, and the embedded VP is a predicate of the bèi (see Huang 1999). Thus, the event/action denoted by the VP must be something that has ‘happened to X’ where X is the experiencer. This thematic structure will give rise to a part-whole relation observed in examples like (27). I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for pointing out this question to me.
forms are also compounds, what is the difference between the \([\text{bei-ADV-V}]\) compounds which allow an adverb inside the \([\text{bei V}]\) and the \([\text{bei-V}]\) compounds which do not?

Second, as the following examples in (29) show, the lexical \([\text{bei-V}]\) compounds (both Modern and Archaic) cannot take an object, but an NP can easily appear in the object position of \([\text{bei VP}]\) short passives, as seen in (4) for Modern Chinese and (15) for Archaic Chinese.

(29) a. *他們家被捕了一個人。
   *Tā.mén jiā bèi bù le yī.gé rén.
   they family BEI arrest ASP one.CL person
   Intended meaning: ‘Their family had one person arrested.’

b. *他們家被警察捕了一個人。
   *Tā.mén jiā bèi jǐng.chá bù le yī.gé rén.
   they family BEI policeman arrest ASP one person
   Intended meaning: ‘Their family had one person arrested by a policeman.’

c. *萬乘之國被圍城 (in Archaic Chinese)
   *Wàn shèng zhī guó bèi wéi chéng. (*=not attested)
   ten.thousand chariot’s country get surround city.
   Intended meaning: ‘A state with ten thousand chariots got surrounded *their city.’

Both the Modern and the Archaic \([\text{bei-V}]\) compounds reject an object NP and both the Modern and the Ancient \([\text{bei-ADV-V}]\) compounds accommodate an object NP\(^8\). Why is that so?

Third, \([\text{bei-V}]\) compounds are (almost) all disyllabic forms and they are undoubtedly lexical items, while the \([\text{bei-ADV-V}]\) forms can hardly be considered, and have never been used as individual lexical items. Of course sizes and usages cannot be taken as an argument against a syntactic analysis of compounding. However, together with their different behaviors with respect to the intervention of adverbs and the ability to take objects, we have good reasons to conclude that the \([\text{bei-V}]\) passives are different from the \([\text{bei-ADV-V}]\) ones. The former is a morphological compound, while the latter is

---

\(^8\) Aside from Archaic Chinese, in Modern and Classical Chinese there are some \([\text{bei V}]\) forms which can also take an NP object, as shown in (15). According to the present analysis, the \([\text{bei V NP}]\) forms have a D-structure like \([[[\text{bei } [\text{V NP}]]]]\), rather than \([[\text{bei-V } \text{NP}]\), even though after VI, the \([\text{bei } [\text{V NP}]\) becomes \([\text{bei-V } \text{NP}]\), as we will see later. This is so because otherwise there would be no distinction between the grammatical \([\text{bei } [\text{V NP}]\), as in (15), and the ungrammatical \([\text{bei-V } \text{NP}]\), as in \([\text{bèi-bù } \text{rén}]\) 被捕人 ‘got arrested *person’ in Modern Chinese and \([\text{bèi wéi } \text{chén}]\) 被圍城 ‘got surrounded *city’ in Archaic Chinese.
more like a phrase-word (Zwicky 1990:206) which involves an utterance larger than a word. Just as Huang (1999) characterizes, it is “combining beǐ with a verb phrase to form a ‘passive verb phrase’”. As a result, even though the [beǐ-ADV-V] forms should better be analyzed as a compound as argued by McCawley and supported by historical facts given above, they seem to be a different type of compounds from the [beǐ-V] forms, given that “compound” has been used as a cover term for a collection of related, but by no means identical phenomena in the literature.

Considering the lexical property of [beǐ-V] compounds and the phrasal characteristics of the [beǐ-ADV-V] passives, I suggest that the former be seen as morphological compounds formed by (prosodic) morphological rules, whereas the latter are phrasal compounds derived by a syntactic operation of Verb Incorporation (Feng 2001). There are good reasons to consider this hypothesis to be highly plausible, as seen below.

First, Verb Incorporation is a process of both morphological and syntactic structure: syntactic in that its distribution and consequences for the structure are determined by syntactic principles; morphological in that the resulting [V+V] structure acts like a compound. Obviously, those properties are what we want the [beǐ-ADV-V] to have—a syntactically determined phrasal compound.

Second, by Verb Incorporation, the [beǐ-ADV-V] compound would have a biclausal underlying structure and a combined surface structure. This is also what we expect. If [beǐ-ADV-V] is derived from a source containing two verbs (beǐ and the embedded V), the adverb is naturally expected to appear before the embedded verb. When VI takes place, the verb could first form a compound with the adverb and then combine with beǐ, yielding a larger verb form. As a result, the compound properties and the phrasal characteristics can both be captured in the resulting complex predicate.

Third, historical facts provide solid evidence for the possibility of VI in the [beǐ-ADV-V] structure. As seen below, the [beǐ-ADV-V] has a [beǐ VP] origin developed independently in the history of Chinese. As argued by Feng (1998), there were three types of beǐ passive structures clearly attested in the history of Chinese:

I. [beǐ V] compound passive (ca. 300 BC)

(30) I. 萬乘之國被圍于趙。(*Zhanguoce 戰國策, Qīcè 齊策, ca. 300 BC)
Wàn shèng zhī guó bèi wéi yú Zhào.
ten thousand chariot ’s country get surround by Zhao
‘A state with ten thousand chariots got surrounded by Zhao.’
II. [bei VP] phrasal passive (ca. 100 AD)

II.a. 横被暴诛 (Wayuechunqiu 吴越春秋, Helü Neizhuan 闔閤內傳, ca. 50 AD)
    hénɡ bèi bào zhū
    unexpectedly get violently kill
    ‘got violently killed unexpectedly.’

II.b. 紛遭外禍，累害之也。(Lunheng 論衡, Leihai 累害, ca.100 AD)
    Fēnzāo wài huò, lěi hài zhǐ yě...
    suffer external disaster accumulatively harm them PRT
    生動之累，咸被累害。
    shēng-dòng zhī lèi, xián bèi lěi hài
    live-move's kind all get accumulatively harm
    ‘One suffers from disasters caused by external factors (because) the situation accumulatively harmed them...all kinds of living and moving creatures will get accumulatively harmed.’

II.c. 被棺殮 (Lunheng 論衡, Duizuo 對作, ca. 100 AD)
    bèi guān liàn
    get coffin bury
    ‘got coffin-buried’

II.d. 多被陰害 (Taipingjing 太平經, ca. 100 AD)
    duō bèi yīn hài
    frequently get invisibly harm
    ‘frequently got invisibly harmed.’

II.e. 即被怒責 (Weishu 魏書, Guangpingwang zhuàn 廣平王傳, ca. 550 AD)
    jí bèi nù zé
    then get angrily scold
    ‘immediately got angrily scolded.’

II.f. 曾被急召 (Nanshi 南史, Renfang zhuàn 任昉傳, ca. 650 AD)
    chánɡ bèi jí zhāo
    ever get urgently call
    ‘once got urgently called in’
III. [bei IP] long passive (ca. 200 AD)⁹

III.a. 臣被尙書召問。 (Cai Yong 蔡邕, Beishoushibiao 被收時表 132-192 AD)
Chén bèi Shàngshū zhāo-wèn.
'I, the subject, got questioned by the Minister.'

III.b. 被明公逼，且喜且懼。 (Dongguan Hanji 東觀漢記, Min Gong zhuan 明公傳, ca. 200 AD)
(Wù) bèi Míng-Gōng bī, qiě xǐ qiě jù.
'I was summoned by (your) Honorable-Duke, I felt both happiness and fear.'

III.c. 被火氣劫故也。 (Shanghanlun 傷寒論, ca. 200 AD)
Bèi huǒqì jíé gù yě.
'Because (the body) was attacked by internal heat.'

As seen in §4, the [bei-V] forms in Archaic Chinese were compounds and the compound passives are kept in Modern Chinese as shown in (16). On the other hand, the examples given in (30-II) must not be analyzed as a compound: an adverb appears before the V, indicating that the V can take a modifier of its own and hence the [ADV V] is not part of a compound but an independent constituent (see Feng 1998 for more arguments). This type of example is extremely important because if the [ADV V] is not part of a compound, it must be analyzed as a VP embedded under bei. If so, it follows that the [bei VP] structure was developed before the long passives in a chronological order of [bei VP] → [bei IP]. This further entails that the [bei VP] structure was established independently of the long passives in history. This discovery confirms Ting’s hypothesis that there are two bei structures in Modern Chinese: one is a long passive ([bei IP]) and the other is a short ([bei VP]). Given the historical evidence, the questions why there are two BEIs in Modern Chinese and how they come about are no longer a mystery: the two bei structures are inherited from Classical Chinese. In fact, the [bei VP] short passive is not only independent of the [bei IP] long passive, but also older than the long form in the history. This provides solid evidence for the argument

⁹ Shanghanlun 傷寒論 was completed by 205 AD, and Cai Yong 蔡邕 (132 AD-192 AD) was the last person who was involved in compiling the Dongguan Hanji 東觀漢記. Given this, examples in (30III) can be taken as the earliest full passives, dating from around 200 AD.
that the short passives ([bei VP]) are not derived from deletion of the agent NP in long passives, since when the [bei VP] structure was established, the [bei IP] structure had not even appeared. The diachronic fact shows that not only the short did not come out of the long, but the other way around might be the case, that is, the long passives were developed from the [bei VP] short passives by introducing the agent NP into the embedded clause, creating an IP when the lexical strength of the matrix verb bei was weakened from a transitive (in [bei VP]) to an intransitive (or may be an auxiliary) verb (in [bei IP]).

According to previous studies (Peyraube 1989, 1996, Tang 1987, Wei 1994, and many others), a relative chronological order of the developments of all bei passives can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronology</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Step-I</th>
<th>Step-II</th>
<th>Step-III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400 BC</td>
<td>bei NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 BC</td>
<td>bei NP</td>
<td>bei N/V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 BC</td>
<td>bei NP</td>
<td>bei V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 AD</td>
<td>bei NP</td>
<td>bei V</td>
<td>bei ADV V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 AD</td>
<td>bei NP</td>
<td>bei V</td>
<td>bei (ADV)V</td>
<td>bei NP V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 AD</td>
<td>bei NP</td>
<td>bei V</td>
<td>bei (ADV)V (NP)</td>
<td>bei NP V (NP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>bei V</td>
<td>bei (ADV)V (NP)</td>
<td>bei NP V (NP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that the bei sentences originated from a [bei NP] structure and further developed a [bei N/V] alternation. As seen before, only in disyllabic environments can the [bei N/V] alternation be observed and the N be reanalyzed as V, giving rise to the [bei-V] compound passive. The [bei-V] compound passive was further developed into a [bei [ADV V]VP] phrasal passive around the Eastern Han dynasty (ca. 100 AD) and finally gave rise to the full passive [bei [NP V]] structure by the late Han (ca. 200 AD). What is important to note here is the fact that every step of the development of the bei sentence was realized by the creation of a new structure: first the [bei-V] compound passive, then the [bei VP] phrasal passive, and finally the [bei IP] full passive. Each structure is historically related but syntactically independent: related in the sense that the latter form would not have come into being without the former one; independent in the sense that the former was not destroyed by the latter one. Instead they both survived and developed into their respective present versions. They had coexisted throughout the history. This is why in Modern Chinese there are still [bei-V] compound passives and why the [bei VP] and [bei IP] behave differently syntactically. Of course, this does not
mean that they would not influence each other. In fact, as seen in Table 1, the appearance of [bei V NP] cases was found only after the birth of the [bei IP] structure, suggesting that the [bei V NP] was further developed under the influence of [bei IP].

Given the historical evidence above, we now have a solid ground to propose that the [bei VP] structure is independent of the [bei-V] compound structure and of the [bei IP] full passive structure. If this is true, it is only natural to expect an independent syntactic operation involving only the [bei VP] structure. As we will see below, the Verb Incorporation is permitted only in the [bei VP] structure.

First, the [bei-V] compound would not involve the VI, simply because they are formed in morphology. Second, the [bei IP] cannot be derived by VI either, because as argued by Li Yafei (1990), the lower verb in an IP complement cannot be incorporated into the matrix verb, as shown in (31)

(31) \( \text{VP}_1[\text{I}_1 \text{ VP}_2[\text{NP}_1] \text{ v}[\text{V}_2 \text{ NP}_2]] \)

\[ \text{bèi zhūwú fān zhī} \quad \text{(被諸物犯之)} \]

get everything attack it

'got attacked by everything.'

By Minimality Condition (Rizzi 1990), \( \text{V}_2 \) must first move to I, and then to \( \text{V}_1 \), in order to form a complex \( \text{[V}_1+\text{V}_2] \) compound. However, such a movement results in what Li Yafei has called a sandwiched chain: \( \text{[V}, \text{I}, \text{V}] \), which is not allowed by Binding Condition C in the theory developed in Y. Li (1990). Therefore, the embedded verb in [bei IP] is not incorporable with bei. The situation, however, is completely different in the [bei VP] structure:

(32) \( \text{VP}_1[\text{V}_1 \text{ VP}_2[\text{V}_2 \text{ NP}]] \)

\[ \text{bèi qǔ dān} \quad \text{(被取膽)} \]

get take gall

The \( \text{V}_2 \) can be minimally moved into \( \text{V}_1 \) forming a \( \text{[V}, \text{V}] \) chain, and no violation of any kind would be caused. Hence VI is permissible only in the [bei VP] structure, given the following surface structure:

(33) \( \text{v}[\text{v}[\text{V}_1\text{V}_2] \text{ VP}_2[\text{e}_1 \text{ NP}]] \)

\[ \text{bèi-qǔ t{i} dān} \quad \text{(被取膽)} \]

get-take gall

The advantages of the VI-analysis can also be seen from several aspects. First, morphology and modal verbs have been universally considered as triggers for Verb
Incorporation. The Verb Incorporation in [bei VP] may also be subject to a morphological factor: the monosyllabic bei cannot stand alone as an independent verb after the grammaticalization in the historical development of the bei passive construction. Huang (1999) distinguishes two stages of grammaticalization of bei in history: originally bei was a transitive verb with two arguments. Later it has weakened to the status of an intransitive and possibly even to the status of an auxiliary or a bound morpheme. The morphological status of being an auxiliary or a bound morpheme provides good reasons for bei to be considered as a trigger for the VI.\textsuperscript{10} If this is so, it follows that VI would not happen until bei was weakened. It is commonly agreed that bei was weakened after the establishment of the full passive [bei IP] (by the Eastern Han) and it is true that only after the appearance of the [bei IP] long form, could one find the [bei V NP] short forms, as seen in Table 1. This strongly favors a VI analysis for the [bei V NP] sentences. If bei needs support morphologically and if bei takes only a bare VP complement in [bei [V NP]_{VP}], VI is forced in this situation. That is, VI must also take place in [NP bei [ADV V NP]_{VP}], so that it first triggers a [ADV-V] compound and then the [ADV-V] is incorporated into bei, forming a [bei-ADV-V] complex, as shown in (34).

\textbf{(34)}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (V) at (0,0) {V'};
  \node (V1) at (-3,-1) {V_1};
  \node (V2) at (-1,-1) {V_2};
  \node (VP2) at (1,-1) {VP_2};
  \node (ADV) at (-2,-2) {ADV};
  \node (NP) at (2,-2) {NP};
  \node (bei) at (-1,-3) {bei};
  \node (sheng) at (-2,-3) {shēng};
  \node (jie) at (0,-3) {jiē};
  \node (qi) at (1,-3) {qí};
  \node (jia) at (2,-3) {jiā};
  \node (get) at (-1,-4) {get};
  \node (alive) at (-2,-4) {alive};
  \node (take-off) at (0,-4) {take-off};

  \draw (V) -- (V1) node[midway,above] {V_1};
  \draw (V) -- (V2) node[midway,above] {V_2};
  \draw (V) -- (VP2) node[midway,above] {VP_2};
  \draw (V_1) -- (ADV); \draw (V_2) -- (ADV); \draw (ADV) -- (bei); \draw (bei) -- (sheng); \draw (bei) -- (jie); \draw (bei) -- (qi); \draw (bei) -- (jia); \draw (bei) -- (get); \draw (bei) -- (alive); \draw (bei) -- (take-off); \end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{10} VI may also be triggered by the oldest [bei-V] compounds, in that bei always tends to form a compound with a monosyllabic verb and the tendency may finally become a general requirement when bei loses its lexical strength and is weakened to an auxiliary. Thus VI must take place in the environment where bei takes only a bare VP. This is possible for the following reasons: if there were no [bei V] compounds, there would have been no [bei Adv V] forms in Mandarin, given the fact that no short passives, except the bei forms, are allowed in Mandarin, or in other Chinese dialects, because other passive verbs, such as ho 與 (Taiwanese) or ràng 讓 (Mandarin), are not developed from a compound.
Second, the asymmetry between [bei-V NP] and [bei-V *pro] can also be captured along this line of reasoning. Since the object NP in [[bei V] NP] can still be assigned a case after Verb Incorporation (see Baker 1988, Y. Li 1992), [[bei V] NP] sentences are/were grammatical throughout Chinese history. An object pronoun is not allowed by VI, however, since incorporation changes government relations by allowing the (matrix) verb to govern something which it otherwise would not have governed (Baker 1988: 101). For example, in Kinyarwanda, P Incorporation changes government relations (taken from Baker 1988:496):

   children SP-PRES-put-ASP books on them
   'The children are putting books on themselves.'

b. Abaana ba-r-il-shyir-a-ho ibitabo.
   children SP-PRES-REFL-put-ASP on books
   'The children are putting books on themselves.'

In (35a), the [NP, PP] is a lexical pronoun and may be coreferential with the matrix subject (the PP counts as ‘Complete Functional Complex’ and hence binding domains in Kinyarwanda). However, when the P is incorporated into the verb as in (35b), morphological reflexivization must apply. This is because, as argued by Baker (1988), the binding domain of the locative NP has been expended by Incorporation. That is, the Incorporation causes the object of P to be externally governed by the matrix verb. Thus its binding domain must include that matrix verb and the matrix subject. What is important here is the fact that when the government relation is changed after the Incorporation process, the governing category for binding relations is also forced to extend to the entire matrix clause (see Baker 1988:101 for parallel cases of NI examples of possessor stranding).

Parallel to the P Incorporation in Kinyarwanda, when the embedded V is incorporated into the matrix verb bei in Chinese, an object pronoun is also disallowed to be coreferential with the subject. This is because the object position of the embedded verb is externally governed by the bei after the VI, thus the governing category for the embedded object pronoun is not the embedded VP, but the entire matrix clause.11

11 One may wonder how to account for the following ungrammatical sentence in a VI analysis:

(i) *教室内,被派约翰找人去扫乾淨了。

*Jiăoshi, bèi pài Yuēhàn zhào rén qu săo-gānjìng tī le
   classroom BEI send John find men to sweep-clean ASP
   Intended meaning: ‘*The classroom was sent John to find people to clean.’

Note that without the agent the embedded clause is a VP, rather than an IP. The [NP, bèi [vp
Another argument in favor of the Verb Incorporation for [bei VP] is that this analysis now has the virtues of both the compound property (as discussed in §4) and the phrasal characteristics (as discussed in §5) of the [bei ADV V NP] short passives. It also has the virtues of both the non-lexical and non-phrasal properties of the forms. Recall that an important feature for morphological (verb) compound is the prosodic constraint of disyllabicity. This constraint is obviously not followed by the verb complex. Now the distinction between the lexical compounds and the complex verb compounds can be made clearly: lexical compounds are formed in (Prosodic) Morphology and must obey prosodic morphological rules, while complex verb compounds are derived in syntax via VI from natural phrases. No length constraint is required for syntactic phrases, hence complex verbs are not constrained by prosodic morphological rules. As a result, lexical compounds always coincide with PrWds, while complex verb compounds involve an utterance larger than a word in size. This is why in both Classical and Modern Chinese lexicon, there are no lexical [bei-V] compounds that are formed into a size longer than a PrWd.\footnote{This holds without exception in Classical Chinese. In Modern Chinese, however, there seems to be an exception in bēi-yāpò jiājì ‘be-oppressed class’. However, bēi-yāpò can occur in bēi lāobān yāpò ‘be oppressed by the boss’, indicating that bēi yāpò is different from lexical compounds such as bēi-pò ‘be forced’ that cannot be separated at all. As a result, bēi yāpò is not a lexical compound.}

6. Summary

In this paper I have argued from both synchronic and diachronic perspectives that short passives in Chinese can be divided into two types of constructions: one is viewed as a lexical compound which supports Ting’s analysis (1996); while the other is viewed as a complex verb, which accords with McCawley’s argument (1992). Furthermore, if the chronology of emergence of the [bei VP] forms is taken into account, three types of operations ranging from morphology (the [bei-V] compound), to morphosyntax (the [[bei V] NP] generated by verb complex via Verb Incorporation) and to phrasal syntax (the [bei V__] derived by NP-movement) can all be observed in history. The varieties of bei forms are not only distinguished chronologically but also structurally, and all of

\begin{itemize}
\item pāi ...*[t ...]] must be ruled out because VI, as seen above, requires a bare VP to be the complement of bei, hence there is neither [Spec, CP] nor [Spec, IP] in the embedded clause. However, the \( t \) in (i) is left by a long-distance movement; hence it must be an \( A' \)-trace. An \( A' \)-movement needs a position like [Spec, CP] or [Spec, IP] in order for the deeply embedded element to be moved out or to be coindexed with its antecedent. Since the bare VP in VI does not have a position of the sort, (i) must be ruled out.
\end{itemize}
them are kept in Modern Mandarin Chinese. It follows that a syntactic analysis must not only take care of the synchronic facts but also their histories. The Modern bei sentences are typical examples of this sort: all four structures, the [bei-V], the [bei V_], the [bei V NP] and the [bei IP] are handed down from Classical Chinese.

The implication of the present analysis is that while synchronic analyses should refer to historical facts, diachronic studies can equally cast light on synchronic research. Clearly the syntactic structure of Classical long passives are captured by the A'-movement analysis developed from Mandarin Chinese (Feng 1990) and the [bei-V] compound analysis for Archaic Chinese is significant in understanding the synchronic behaviors of [bei V] short passives in Modern Chinese. From the synchronic analysis, we draw insights that allow us to account for long passives in Classical Chinese, and based on this diachronic study we were able to discover a variety of short passives in Modern Chinese.
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