THE NATURE OF THE PARTICLE SUO IN THE PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN CLASSICAL CHINESE

Jen Ting
National Taiwan Normal University

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this article is to determine the syntactic nature of the particle suō in passive constructions in Classical Chinese. We argue that this particle is licensed in a similar, though not identical, fashion in Classical relatives and passives. More specifically, it is licensed in an A'-configuration provided by these two constructions and undergoes overt N⁰ to I⁰ movement. Crucially, however, suō does not undergo further I⁰ to C⁰ movement at LF in Classical passives and thus contrasts with its counterpart in Classical relatives, which, as claimed by Ting (2005) exhibits such an operation. Under this analysis, the particle suō in Classical relatives bears a [+wh] feature whereas its counterpart in Classical passives bears a [–wh] feature and is bound by a null operator. The former is thus an operator whereas the latter is a variable. The implications of this analysis that emerge for the ‘short’ passives in Classical Chinese and for the ‘linker’ between a relative clause and its head noun in Classical and Contemporary Chinese are also discussed. The result of this investigation is shown to resolve the long-lasting controversy over the status of suō in relatives and passives in Classical Chinese and furthermore to provide an example of applying new theoretical tools to the study of Classical Chinese grammar.

SUBJECT KEYWORDS
Classical Chinese, Particle suō, Clitic, Passive construction, Head movement
1. INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this article is to determine the syntactic nature of the particle *suo* in passive constructions in Classical Chinese. The original and also most common use of this particle is in a relative-clause-like construction as in (1).

(1) a. 仲子所居之室，伯夷之所筑乎？（孟子、滕文公下）

Zhongzi suo ju zhi shi, Boyi zhi suo zhu hu
Zhongzi SUO live ZHI room Boyi ZHI SUO build HU
(Mengzi. Tengwengongxia)
‘the room that Zhongzi lives, the place Bouyi built?’

b. 而语及所匿之事（韩非子、说难）

er yu ji suo ni zhi shi
‘But we might mention what was hidden (by him).’

c. 民所食之粟（adapted from（孟子、滕文公））

min suo shi zhi su (adapted from Menzi. Tengwengong)
people SUO eat ZHI barley
‘the barley that people eat’

Its occurrence in the ‘wei (+NP)+V’ construction, a traditionally recognized passive construction (see e.g. L. Wang 1958), illustrated in (2), is a later development. This new usage, as L. Wang (1958) points out, emerged in the Han period.

(2) a. 汉军却，为楚所挤（史记、项羽本记）

Han jun que, wei Chu suo ji (Shiji. Xiangyu Benji)
Han army retreat WEI Chu SUO push
‘The Han army retreated and was pressured by the Chu army.’

b. 微赵君，几为丞相所卖（史记、李斯列传）

wei Zhao jun, ji wei chengxiang suo mai
without Zhao gentleman almost WEI prime-minister SUO sell
(Shiji. Lisi Liezhuan)
‘Without Mr. Zhao, I was almost betrayed by the prime minister.’
c. 卫太子为江充所败（汉书、霍光传）
Wei taizi  wei  Jiangchong suo  bai (Hanshu. Huoguang Zhuan)
Wei prince WEI Jiangchong SUO defeat
‘The Prince of Wei was defeated by Jiangchong.’
d. 不者，若属皆且为所掳（史记、项羽本纪）
bu zhe,  ruo shu jie qie wei suo lu. (Shiji. Xiangyu Benji)
not ZHE you people all also WEI SUO arrest
‘If you don’t do so, all your people will be arrested.’
e. 岱不从 …… 果为所杀（三国志、魏书、武帝纪）
Dai bu cong …… guo wei suo sha (Sangguo Zhi. Weishu. Wudi Ji)
Dai not follow …indeed WEI SUO kill
‘Dai did not follow and ended up being killed.’

Given occurrence of suo in these two apparently different syntactic environments, namely relatives and passives, it becomes an interesting issue to consider how this particle is licensed in these two constructions and whether the particle is of the same nature. Our answer is that the particle suo is licensed in a similar, though not identical, fashion in Classical relatives and passives. More specifically, we argue that suo is licensed in an A’-configuration provided by these two constructions and that in both constructions suo undergoes overt N0 to I0 movement. Crucially, however, suo does not undergo further I0 to C0 movement at LF in Classical passives and thus contrasts with its counterpart in Classical relatives, which, as claimed by Ting (2005) exhibits such operation. Under our analysis, the particle suo in Classical relatives bears a [+wh] feature whereas its counterpart in Classical passives bears a [–wh] feature and is bound by a null operator. The former is thus an operator whereas the latter is a variable. This analysis of suo in Classical passives will be supported by the comparison of its syntactic behavior with that of its counterpart in Classical relatives and in Contemporary passives.
This article is organized as follows: Section 2 reviews previous analyses of \textit{suo} in Classical passives and of its syntactic relation to its counterpart in Classical relatives. As a first step to investigating the structures that license the newly developed \textit{suo}, we argue for the true passive status for the form ‘\textit{wei} (+NP)+ V’ and the form ‘\textit{wei} (+NP) + \textit{suo} V’ in Section 3. In Section 4, we consider the analysis of \textit{suo} in Contemporary and Classical relatives put forth by Ting (2003, 2005) as a basis for further discussion of the particle’s syntactic nature in Classical passives. Section 5 lays out an analysis of \textit{suo} in Classical passives, providing arguments for it being an A’-bound clitic in passive constructions both with and without an overt logical subject. Section 6 addresses some implications that arise from this proposal. Section 7 concludes this article.

2. PREVIOUS ANALYSES

Most of the attention concerning the syntax of the \textit{suo} construction has been given to occurrence of this particle in Classical relatives. There are essentially two lines. Some regard it as a pronoun of some sort (Ma 1898, L. Wang 1958, Chu 1987, X. Zhu 1996, F. Liu 1937, Chao 1968, Song 1996, Z. Zhang 1996, R. He 1954, Dong 1998), while others treat it as a construction particle (S. Xu 1963, K. Wang 1982, Chou 1961, Y. Liu 1990, R. Li 1982, D. Zhu 1983, Yang and He 1992). In either approach, the function of \textit{suo} results in turning the whole \textit{suo} V sequence into a nominal, which is construed as an object, locative, reason or manner expression associated with the predicate preceded by \textit{suo}.

Among the analyses that address the question of \textit{suo}’s licensing in the \textit{wei} constructions,\textsuperscript{3} there are also two lines. One approach is to treat \textit{suo} in such constructions as the \textit{suo} in relatives. In other words, \textit{suo} is analyzed as a pronoun (Ma 1898, Chu 1987, X. Zhu 1996) or as a construction particle (K. Wang 1982, S. Xu 1963, Y. Liu 1990, R. Li 1982) in both constructions. Under this approach, the \textit{wei-suo} forms are generally construed in line with Ma’s (1898) interpretation.\textsuperscript{4} That is, a \textit{wei-suo} form is \textit{wei} + a free relative clause containing \textit{suo}; \textit{wei} is treated either as a copula \textit{to be} (Ma 1898, Chou 1959), or as a semi-copula \textit{to become} (e.g. S. Xu}
1963, Chu 1987, Wei 1994). Given this interpretation, (2c) would have a reading like (3): The prince of Wei is/becomes the person who Jiangchong defeated. Accordingly, the passive sense conveyed by this construction is derived through relativization.

(3) 卫太子为江充所败之人
Wei taizi wei Jiangchong suo bai zhi ren
Wei prince WEI Jiangchong SUO defeat ZHI person
‘The prince of Wei was the person that Jiangchong defeated.’

In contrast to this unified approach, the non-unified approach (F. Liu 1937, L. Wang 1958, Song 1996, Dong 1998) considers suo in the wei construction as a different entity from the one in the relatives. Generally agreeing upon the pronominal nature of suo in relatives, all these analyses treat suo as a sort of signal or marker of a passive construction, only slightly differing in labeling suo as a verbal prefix (L. Wang 1958, Song 1996, Dong 1998) or a construction particle (Yang and He 1992). Under such an approach, the independence of the wei-suo passives is recognized. Thus, (2) has a reading on a par with other types of passives in (4), a view also shared by Yang (1928).

(4) 卫太子见败于江充
Wei taizi jian bai yu Jiangchong
Wei prince JIAN defeat YU Jiangchong
‘The prince of Wei was defeated by Jiangchong.’

Appealing as they are, neither the unified nor the non-unified approach is entirely satisfactory. Theoretically, the unified approach is certainly more desirable since it does not seem to require any additional machinery for the behavior of suo in the wei constructions. Unfortunately, Ma’s (1898) interpretation of the wei-suo forms has been challenged by many later works (e.g. R. He 1954). On the other hand, although the non-unified approach avoids the problem of distorting the reading of the
wei-suo forms and acknowledges their status of a passive construction, one cannot help wondering whether suo is indeed licensed in such different fashions in the relatives and passives. To reconcile these two approaches, the main claim to be made in this article is that suo is licensed in a similar, though not identical, fashion in Classical relatives and passives. Therefore, suo in the two constructions is not treated as totally different entities and the merits of the unified approach are maintained. On the other hand, the wei-suo forms are treated on a par with other types of passives in Classical Chinese and the advantages of the non-unified approach are maintained.


As a first step to investigating the structures that license the newly developed suo, we argue for the true passive status for the form ‘wei(+NP)+V’ and the form ‘wei(+NP)+suo+V’ in this section. Regarding ‘true passives’, we follow the general agreement (e.g. Siewierska 1984) that a typical passive clause has the same propositional content as its active counterpart and thus that “the NPs in the two constructions are generally viewed as having the same semantic roles.” (Siewierska 1984:3)

A standard view of the form ‘wei (+ NP)+V’ and ‘wei (+NP)+ suo+V’ as represented by Tang and Zhou (1985) and Peyraube (1989) (cf. L. Wang 1958) is as follows. The form ‘wei (+NP)+V’ is considered the second most common passive form in Archaic Chinese. It appeared in Late Archaic and continued to exist in Han or Pre Medieval but constantly decreased in usage percentage. On the other hand, the form ‘wei (+NP)+suo+V’, despite its rare occurrence in Late Archaic, gained increasing use in Han. As a result, the form ‘wei (+NP)+suo+V’ outnumbered the form ‘wei (+NP)+V’ in the Late Han and became the most common passive form in Early Medieval. Both forms were phasing out in Late Medieval when the form ‘bei (+ NP)+V’ became widespread.

More recently, however, this standard view that treats the form ‘wei (+NP)+V’ as a passive in Archaic Chinese has been challenged by Wei (1994), Reynolds (1996)
and Yao (1999). As is shown by several arguments provided by Yao (1999), the so-called passive form ‘wei (+NP)+V’ as in (5a) is on a par with other wei constructions with such a pattern as in (5b),\(^6\) in which wei is a (semi-)copula.

\[(5)\]
\[\text{a. } \text{管蔡为戮 (左传、襄公二十一年)}\]
\[\text{Guan Cai wei lu (Zuozhan. Xianggong Ershiyi Nian)}\]
\[\text{Guan Cai WEI kill}\]
\[\text{‘Guan and Cai were killed.’}\]

\[\text{b. 唯女子与小人为难养也 (论语、阳货)}\]
\[\text{wei nuzi yu xiaoren wei nan yang ye}\]
\[\text{only woman and near-sighted:people WEI difficult get:alone YE}\]
\[\text{‘Only women and near-sighted people are hard to get along with.’}\]
\[\text{(Lunyu. Yanghuo)}\]

Similarly, Wei (1994) also maintains that the so-called passive V in some instances of the wei construction is better analyzed as a nominal expression as shown by the modifier da ‘big’ in (6) and by the occurrence of a nominalization marker zhi in (6b).

\[(6)\]
\[\text{a. 然后身死国亡, 为天下大僇 (荀子、非相)}\]
\[\text{ranhou shen si guo wang, wei tianxia da lu (Xunzi. Feixiang)}\]
\[\text{then body die country die WEI world big shame}\]
\[\text{‘Then when he died and his state was lost, he was laughed at by the world.’}\]

\[\text{b. 身死国亡, 为天下之大僇 (荀子、强国)}\]
\[\text{shen si guo wang, wei tianxia zhi da lu (Xunzi. Qiangguo)}\]
\[\text{body die country die WEI world ZHI big shame}\]
\[\text{‘When he died and his state was lost, it was a big shame in the world.’}\]

The passive status of the form ‘wei (+NP)+V’ in Late Archaic is further rendered questionable by an observation made by Wei (1994) and Reynolds (1996);
that is, the lexical items that can occur as V in this pattern are actually quite limited. The inventory pointed out by Wei includes \textit{lu} (戮) “to humiliate”, \textit{xiao} (笑) “to laugh at”, \textit{yong} (用) “to use”, \textit{qin} (擒) “to catch”, \textit{yi} (役) “to serve” and \textit{shi} (使) “to make”, to which \textit{ci} (赐) “to grant”, \textit{zhi} (制) “to control”, \textit{huo} (获) “to capture”, \textit{lu} (虏) “to take prisoner” and \textit{li} (隶) “to take enslave” are added by Reynolds (1996). This limitation on productivity thus casts doubt on the analysis of the form ‘\textit{wei} (+NP)+V’ as true passives. If these arguments provided by Wei, Reynolds and Yao are valid, then it indicates that the form ‘\textit{wei} (+NP)+V’ in Archaic Chinese is nothing but a (semi-)copula construction. Nevertheless, following the insight of Wei (1994), we would like to argue that this form ‘\textit{wei} (+NP)+V’ started to behave as a true passive in Han. As Wei notes, the limitation on lexical choice was lifted in Han. Thus a wide variety of verbs may occur in this pattern. Also, as has been noticed by many researchers (e.g. L. He 1992 and Wei 1994), the gap in the ‘\textit{wei} (+NP)+V’ pattern can be occupied by a pronoun co-referential with the grammatical subject in Han as in (7).

\begin{equation}
\text{今（吾子）为赤帝子斩之, 故哭（史记、高祖本纪）}
\end{equation}

\begin{verbatim}
jin (wu zi) wei chi di zi zhan zhi, gu ku (Shiji. Gaozu Benji)
now my son WEI red emperor son behead ZHI so cry
\end{verbatim}

‘Now my son got beheaded by the Red Emperor’s son so I am crying.’

If \textit{wei} is a (semi-)copula, there seems to be no easy way to nominalize the following string containing the pronoun \textit{zhi}. A more natural analysis is thus that sentences like (7) are true passives. We shall now turn to the \textit{wei-suo} forms. Are they true passives? Many researchers give a negative answer such as those who adopt interpretations in line with Ma (1898). Yao (1999), in contrast, provides several arguments for their passive status. We provide additional arguments in support of analyzing the \textit{wei-suo} forms as true passives based on their eventuality types. Notice that those who deny the passive status of the \textit{wei-suo} pattern either analyze \textit{wei} as a copula (e.g. Ma 1898, Chou
1959), or semi-copula (e.g. S. Xu 1963, Chu 1987, Wei 1994). Treating *wei* as a copula in the *wei-suo* pattern, as R. He (1954) and L. Wang (1958) argue, would wrongly construe an eventive sentence as stative, since the main predicate is a copula. Similarly, treating *wei* as a semi-copula with the meaning “become” also runs into problems concerning the situation type presented by the *wei-suo* pattern. The predicate *become* is of the situation type ‘accomplishment’, denoting a change of state (Smith 1991). If the *wei-suo* pattern indeed has a *become*-type predicate as the main predicate, the sentence would necessarily present a change of state even when the verb following *wei* is of situation type activity. This is, however, not true. A passivized activity verb, in fact, may still present an activity situation. We now consider how to distinguish between an accomplishment situation and an activity situation in Chinese.

(8)  a. ta piping Lisi liang tian le
    he criticize Lisi two day LE
    ‘He has been criticizing Lisi for two days.’

    b. ta chengwei xiaofangyuan liang tian le
    he become fireman      two day  LE
    ‘It has been two days since he became a fireman.’

As Gong (1995) points out, a duration phrase following an activity verb presents the duration of the event as in (8a). On the other hand, the duration phrase following an accomplishment verb presents the duration of the resulting state rather than the duration of the activity as in (8b).

When applying this test, we find that the passivized activity verb indeed may still present an activity situation because the duration phrase denotes the duration of the activity as in (9a). In contrast, if a *wei-suo* form involves a *become*-type predicate, then it would have an interpretation as in (9b), in which the duration phrase denotes the duration of the resulting state.
Thus analyzing a passive construction as having a become-type main predicate runs into a serious problem of turning all the passive sentences into the accomplishment situation, which is contrary to fact. Given this semantic consideration, we do find that there are wei-suo forms which may present an activity situation modified by adverbials of duration, as illustrated in (10), taken from Reynolds (1996).

(10) 故宜久为福禄所养也（郑笺）
    gu yi jiu wei fu lu suo yang ye (Zheng Jian)
    so appropriate long WEI happiness official’s-salary SUO rear YE
    ‘Thus it is fitting that he should be reared by good luck and fortune for a long time.’

If such sentences are analyzed as involving a become-type main predicate, the situation type would be changed to accomplishment. Based on the semantic consideration, we thus conclude that the wei-suo passives should be treated on a par with other types of passives in Classical Chinese instead of having the become-type verb as the main predicate.

In brief, we have argued that both forms ‘wei (+NP)+V’ and ‘wei (+NP)+suo+V’ have been true passives since the Han period. Given the fact that the wei-passives do not rely on the occurrence of suo to be acceptable as shown by (11), it is reasonable to conclude that suo is optional in Classical passives.
多多益善，何以为我擒？（《史记·淮阴侯列传》）

duoduo yishan, he yi wei wo qin (Shiji. Huangyinhou Liezhuan)
much better why YI WEI I arrest

‘If it’s the case that the more soldiers you have, the better you can lead them, then how come you were arrested by me?’

As to whether the *wei-suo* passives are derived from the *wei* passives, despite a positive answer given under the standard view, we, following Wei (1994), will not be concerned about this issue. What matters for us is that the *wei* passives have been true passives since the Han period and that they optionally allow the occurrence of * suo*.10

4. THE LICENSING OF *SUO* IN CLASSICAL AND CONTEMPORARY RELATIVES

As the particle *suo* also occurs in other constructions in Classical and Contemporary Chinese, consideration of the behaviors and analyses of it in these constructions will provide a clue in developing an adequate analysis of it in Classical passives. We now briefly present the analysis of *suo* in Contemporary and Classical relatives put forth by Ting (2003, 2005).11 Consider the proposed derivations illustrated in (12) for Contemporary Chinese and (13) for Classical Chinese.

(12) Contemporary relatives

Before Spell-out and at LF: 

\[
[CP \text{ Op, } [C [\text{renmin } su_0 \\text{ chi } t_i] [c^0 \text{ de}]] \text{ sumi}_i \] \text{ people SUO eat DE barley}
\]

(13) Classical relatives

a. Before Spell-out: 

\[
[CP [\text{民所食} t_i] [c^0]] \text{之粟}_i \\
[CP [\text{min su}_0 \\text{ shi } t_i] [c^0]] \text{ zhi}^{12} \text{ su}_i \] \text{ people SUO eat ZHI barley}
\]

b. At LF: 

\[
[CP [\text{min } t'_i \\text{ shi } t_i] [c^0 \text{ su}_0]] \text{ su}_i
\]
In both Contemporary and Classical relatives, *suo* is argued to undergo successive cyclic movement out of the NP it heads and adjoins to P, just as Romance clitics do (Burzio 1986, Kayne 1989, and Pollock 1989, among others, cf. Baltin 1982). Such movement is importantly subject to the Head Movement Constraint (Travis 1984, which can be reduced to the Empty Category Principle as in Chomsky 1986 and Baker 1988). The only difference is that *suo* in Classical relatives further raises to Comp at LF and is thus an operator as in (13). By contrast, *suo* in Contemporary relatives remains in Infl, bound by a null operator and thus is a variable as in (12).

The N\textsuperscript{0} to I\textsuperscript{0} movement of *suo* in both Contemporary and Classical relatives captures the shared properties of *suo* in these two constructions. For example, the same subject/object licensing asymmetry as illustrated in (14) for Contemporary Chinese and in (15) for Classical Chinese is now attributed to the ECP effects induced by the head movement.

(14) Contemporary Chinese:

a. Lisi suo  ai  __ de  ren (grammatical object)
   Lisi SUO love  DE  person
   ‘the person that Lisi loves’

b. *  __ suo  ai  Lisi de  ren (grammatical subject)
   SUO love Lisi DE  person
   ‘the person that loves Lisi’

(15) Classical Chinese:

a. 良人者所仰望  ____  而终身也 (孟子、齐人有一妻一妾)
   liang ren zhe  suo  yangwang  er  zhongshen ye
   good person ZHE SUO admire  and  all:life  YE
   (Mengzi.Qiren you yi yi qie) (grammatical object)
   ‘A good person *(is) someone that one admires and relies on for a whole life.’
b. *__ 所耕田之牛; *__ 所食粟之民 (grammatical subject)
   *__ suo geng tian zhi  niu; *__ suo shi  su  zhi  min
   SUO plow field ZHI cattle; SUO eat barley ZHI people
   ‘the cattle that plow the rice field; the people that eat the barley’

The surface Infl position of suo is reflected by its fixed position with respect to other elements in the clause. For example, VP-level adverbs follow suo in Contemporary Chinese ((16a/b)) and in Classical Chinese ((17a)) whereas sentence-level adverbs precede suo in Contemporary Chinese ((16c/d)) and in Classical Chinese ((17b)).

(16) Contemporary Chinese

a. women suo  yiqi  kan  de  dianying
   we SUO together see DE movie
   ‘the movie that we just saw together’

b. *women  yiqi  suo  kan  de  dianying
   we together SUO see DE movie

c. ta  zuichu  suo  jingying  de  shiye
   he originally SUO operate DE business
   ‘the business that he originally operated’

d. *ta  suo  zuichu  jingying  de  shiye
   he SUO originally operate DE business
   ‘the business that he originally operated’

(17) Classical Chinese

a. 和氏璧，天下所共传宝也。（史记、廉颇蔺相如列传）
   He shi  bi  tianxia  suo  gong  chuan  bao  ye
   HE surname jade the:world SUO together recognize treasure YE
   (Shiji. Lianpo Linxiangru Liezhuang)
   ‘The Heshi jade *(is) a treasure that is unanimously recognized by the world.’
b. 伍子胥初所与俱亡 (史记、伍子胥列传)
Wuzixu chu suo yu ju wu (Shiji, Wuzixu liezhuan)
Wuzixu early SUO with together die
‘the people that Wuzixu died with earlier’

The N° to ¹° movement of suo is supported by the fact that suo never co-occurs with a pronoun co-referential with the head noun of the relative clause in both Contemporary and Classical Chinese as shown in (18), suggesting that suo and the pronoun compete for the same underlying complement position of the verb.

(18)  a. *Zhangsan suo jiao-guo ta san nian de xuesheng
Zhangsan SUO teach-ASP he three year DE student
‘the student that Zhangsan taught for three years’

b. *良人者所仰望之而终身也 (adapted from孟子、齐人有一妻一妾)
*liang ren zhe suo yangwang zhi er zhongshen ye
good person ZHE SUO admire he and all:life YE
(Mengzi. Qiren you yi qi yi qie) (grammatical object)
‘A good person *(is) someone that one admires and relies on for the whole life.’

The further LF movement of suo to Comp in Classical relatives is argued to be shown by the contrast that suo is optional in Contemporary relatives in (19) but obligatory in Classical relatives as in (20) (for the discussion of the latter, see Yao 1998, S. Xu 1963).

(19) niu (suo) geng de tian; renmin (suo) chi de sumi
cattle SUO plow DE field; people SUO eat DE barley
‘the field that the cattle plow; the barley that people eat’
According to Ting (2003, 2005), *su*o in Contemporary relatives is optional because it is resumptive in nature, licensed by being bound by a null operator. *Su*o in Classical relatives, on the other hand, is an operator itself, undergoing further movement to $C^0$ at LF. That null operator movement does not apply in overt syntax in Classical relatives, which yields obligatory occurrence of *su*o, is argued to follow from the claim that such movement would be blocked by the LF movement of the operator *su*o itself, given the economy principle (Chomsky 1991) that overt syntactic movement is more costly than LF movement and the assumption that moving a phrase is more costly than moving a head.

5. ANALYSIS OF SUO IN CLASSICAL PASSIVES

5.1. *Suo* as an A'-bound Clitic

If this analysis of *su*o proposed by Ting (2003, 2005) is on the right track, then what is the nature of *su*o in Classical passives? We shall argue that it is licensed in a way that *su*o is licensed in Contemporary relatives. That is, it is a clitic undergoing $N^0$ to $I^0$ movement, bound by a null operator at the surface Infl position and is thus a variable.
First, the fact that *suo* in Classical passives also occurs in a preverbal position and may precede VP-level adverbs ((21a)) and follow sentence-level adverbs ((21b)) indicates that it is also a clitic in the Infl position in Classical passives.

(21) a. (广) 为虏所生得，当斩（史记、匈奴列传）

(Guang) wei lu  suo  sheng de, dang zhan (Shiji. Xiongnu Liezhuan)

‘Li Guang was arrested alive by the enemies so he should be beheaded.’

b. 上谷太守阎志 …… 为比能素所归信（三国志、刘放传注引魏氏春秋）

Shanggu taishou  Yanzhi, ….. wei  Bineng su  suo  guixin

‘The county-magistrate of Shang-gu, Yan-zhi ….. has always been obeyed by Bineng.’ (notes on Sanguo Zhi. Liufang Zhuan citing Weishi Chunqiu)

Second, although the postverbal complement position of the passive verb may be occupied by a pronoun *zhi* co-referential with the grammatical subject as shown in (7), repeated here as (22), this is hardly attested when *suo* is also present.13

(22) 今（吾子）为赤帝子斩之，故哭（史记、高祖本纪）

jin (wu zi) wei  chi di  zi  zhan  zhi, gu ku (Shiji.Gaozu Benji)

‘Now my son got beheaded by the Red Emperor’s son so I am crying.’

This fact shows that *suo* and *zhi* do compete for the same position and this is captured by the N° to I° analysis of *suo*.

Furthermore, given the analysis of *suo* in Contemporary and Classical relatives proposed by Ting (2003, 2005), the optionality of *suo* in Classical passives as discussed in Section 3 shows that *suo* in Classical passives is a variable rather than an operator because no further I° to C° movement is required. Given this analysis, then an immediate question arises: where is the operator located that binds it? To
answer this question, it is necessary to consider the structure of the \textit{bei} construction in Contemporary Chinese first.

A bi-clausal A’-configuration of \textit{bei} sentences with an overt logical subject has been argued for by Ting (1998) and Huang (1999), followed by many others (e.g. S. Tang 2003) as shown in (23).

\begin{verbatim}
(23) Zhongguo, bei [IP Op, [IP Riben qinlue t]]
    Zhongguo BEI Japan invade
    ‘Zhongguo was invaded by Japan.’
\end{verbatim}

This analysis is supported by the fact that long-distance passivization is allowed as in (24a) and that post-verbal pronouns co-referential with the matrix subject may occur in the gap in the \textit{bei} passives as in (24b). Both are hallmarks of an A’-configuration.

\begin{verbatim}
(24) a. Zhangsan bei guanfu pai shibing zhua-zou le
    Zhangsan BEI government send soldier catch-go LE
    ‘Zhangsan was affected by the government’s sending the soldier’s catching him away.’

b. Zhangsan bei Lisi henhende jiaoxun-le ta yidun
    Zhangsan BEI lisi severely criticized-ASP he once
    ‘Zhangsan was severely criticized by Lisi.’
\end{verbatim}

Note that the fact illustrated in (24b) also shows that a \textit{bei} sentence is bi-clausal; otherwise, violation of Binding Condition B would arise.

Under this approach, the logical subject \textit{Japan} in (23) is an embedded subject, getting Case in the same fashion as an embedded subject in a typical ECM construction involving causative verbs in (25).
(25) Zhangsan rang/pai/jiao [Lisi piping nage ren]
Zhangsan let/send/ask [Lisi criticize that person]
‘Zhangsan let/sent/asked Lisi to criticize that person.’

Given no obvious differences in the syntactic behaviors of the Classical wei passives and Contemporary bei passives when the overt logical subject is present (cf. S. Li 1994), e.g. a post-verbal object of the passive verb is also licensed in the Classical wei passives in (26), a natural conclusion is that they have a parallel structure. Thus, we suggest that a gapped wei passive also involves null operator movement in a bi-clausal A’-configuration as in (26). The logical subject wo ‘I’ is assigned Case in an ECM fashion.

(26) 何以为 [Ip OpIp 我擒 t]
he yi wei [Ip OpIp wo qin t]
why YI WEI I capture
‘Why were you captured by me?’

We may now extend Ting’s (1998) analysis of a bei passive with suo to its wei passive counterpart in Classical Chinese. Under this analysis, suo undergoes N0 to I0 raising and is bound by a null operator adjoined to the complement clause taken by bei in Contemporary ((27a)) and by wei in Classical Chinese ((27b)).

(27) a. Zhongguo bei [Ip Op, Ip Riben suo, qinlue t]
    China BEI Japan SUO invade
    ‘China was invaded by Japan.’

b. 卫太子为 [Ip Op, Ip Jiangchong suo, bai t]
    Wei taizi wei [Ip Op, Ip Jiangchong suo, bai t]
    Wei prince WEI Jiangchong SUO defeat
    ‘The prince of Wei was defeated by Jiangchong.’
In other words, it is this null operator that binds *suo* at I\(^0\) after N\(^0\) to I\(^0\) movement applies. There is no further I\(^0\) to C\(^0\) movement of *suo* at LF in both Contemporary and Classical passives.

It is necessary to note that this bi-clausal analysis of *wei* (and *wei-suo*) passives, as supported by the possible occurrence of a post-verbal pronominal object, renders implausible the analysis of *wei* as a preposition in Yang and He (1992)\(^{14}\) or as an auxiliary in R. He (1954) and L. Wang (1958).\(^{15}\) Such examples are only possible with a mono-clausal structure.

Before proceeding to the structure of *wei* passives without an overt logical subject in the next section, we shall consider some complications that arise with this bi-clausal analysis of the *wei-suo* passives. As investigated by Ting (2005), in Classical relatives, an adjunct expression or a prepositional object can serve as a referent of *suo* as in (28).

(28) a. 他日，子夏、子张、子游…… 欲以所事孔子事之。
    tari         Zixia  Zizhang Ziyou ....
    the:other:day Zixia  Zizhang  Ziyou
    yu   yi   suo  shi  Kongzi  shi  zhi  (孟子、滕文公)(manner)
    want with  SUO  serve Confucius  serve  he  (Mengzi. Tengwengong)
    ‘The other day, Zixia, Zizhang and Ziyou….. wanted to serve him in the
    way they served Confucius.’

b. 是吾剑之所从坠。（吕氏春秋、察今）
    shi     wu     jian  zhi  suo  cong  zhu (Lushichunqiu. Chajin)
    this  my  sword  ZHI  SUO  from  fall
    ‘This is the place where my sword fell from.’

If *suo* in both Classical relatives and passives involve N\(^0\) to I\(^0\) raising, then can these expressions be the grammatical subject of the *wei-suo* passives as in (29)?
Because it has not been reported in the literature that such expressions can be the subject of a *wei-suo* passive, we consider that such examples with the intended passive readings are not possible. Given the proposal by Ting (2005) that in Classical Chinese, these expressions are actually objects of a (null) verb, one may wonder why they are allowed to raise to $I^0$ in Classical relatives but not in Classical passives. We would like to suggest that as in Classical relatives, *suo* standing for an adjunct expression or oblique object in Classical passives is also allowed to undergo $N^0$ to $I^0$ raising and that unacceptability of such examples as in (30) is due to thematic constraints rather than constraints on head movement.

First, note a contrast between *suo* in Contemporary relatives and in *bei* passives: despite being licensed in Contemporary relatives headed by a locative expression in (31a), *suo* is not licensed in a parallel *bei* construction with locative expressions being the grammatical subject in the matrix clause in (31b).
This contrast can be captured if *be* is a two place predicate assigning an Experiencer theta-role to the NP in the grammatical subject position as proposed by Ting (1995, 1998).

(32) *be*: [Experiencer [ __ [Eventuality]]]

The ungrammaticality of (31b) now naturally follows from the inability of the locative to be assigned an experiencer theta-role and is thus not due to violation of the head movement constraint.

This analysis is supported on universalist grounds. Even in a language which presumably does not involve any movement in the passive construction, an adjunct expression cannot serve as the grammatical subject. Consider the so-called indirect passives in Japanese in which the grammatical subject is not associated with a ‘gap’ in the sentence as in (33), taken from Kitagawa and Kuroda (1992).

(33) Yamadasan-ga akanboo-ni nak-are-ta.

Yamadasan-Nom baby-by cry-Pass-Past

‘Yamadasan was affected by a baby’s crying.’

This fact favors an analysis that does not involve any movement in this construction but rather base-generation of the grammatical subject as pursued by Kitagawa and Kuroda (1992). Note crucially that an adjunct expression cannot serve as the grammatical subject of an indirect passive in Japanese as illustrated by the contrast in
The unacceptable (34b) can be attributed to the violation of the argument structure of the passive morpheme –

(34) a. Kare-wa sono kaisya-de hatarai-teiru.
    he-Top that company-at work-Progressive
    'He works in that company'

b. *Sono kaisya-wa kare-ni hatarak-are-teiru
    that company-Top him-by work-PASS-Progressive
    Lit. That company is worked in by him.

If a passive morpheme does have an argument structure in Chinese and Japanese, it is natural to suppose that 
wei, like bei, also assigns an experiencer theta-role to the grammatical subject NP, given the earlier reached conclusion that Contemporary bei passives and Classical wei passives have parallel structures. As a result, examples with suo standing for an adjunct expression or oblique object as in (29) cannot be licensed as a passive construction.¹⁸

5.2. *Suo in Classical Short Passives

We shall now turn to the structure of the passives without an overt logical subject in Classical passives. For ease of presentation, such passives will be referred to as short passives and those with an overt logical subject, long passives, following the terminology of Ting (1995, 1998).¹⁹ Consider a puzzling contrast in the licensing of suo in Contemporary short bei passives and Classical short wei passives, the latter repeated from (2e), as shown in (35b).

(35) a. *Zhongguo bei __ suo qinlue
    China BEI SUO invade
    ‘China was invaded.’
It has been pointed out by Ting (1998) that *suo* does not occur with the passive verb in Contemporary short *bei* passives as in (35a). This is because Contemporary short passives involve A-movement rather than an A'-configuration and thus *suo* is not licensed. Then how is *suo* licensed in Classical short passives?

Given the analysis proposed in section 5.1, a simple explanation is that the *wei-suo* passive without an overt logical subject in (35b) must have an A'-configuration in which *suo* is licensed. We propose that it has the relevant partial structure as in (36).

(36)  \[ \text{Dai} \ldots \text{wei} \ [\text{IP} \text{Op} \text{i} [\text{IP} \text{pro} \text{i} \text{suo} \text{i} \text{sha} \text{t} \text{i}]]] \]

Here, the implicit logical subject sitting in the embedded subject position is represented as a pro, whose content is recoverable from the context. *Suo* is licensed as what we have seen earlier. Another question arises why the Contemporary *bei* passive does not allow its embedded subject to be a pro as in (37).

(37)  \[ *\text{Zhongguo} \text{bei} \ [\text{IP} \text{Op} \text{i} [\text{IP} \text{pro} \text{su} \text{o} \text{i} \text{qinlue} \text{t} \text{i}]]] \]

‘China was invaded.’

This contrast in the licensing of *suo* in Classical and Contemporary short passives actually follows from an independent structural difference between Contemporary and Classical Chinese. That is, Classical Chinese, but not Contemporary Chinese, allows its embedded subject of an ECM complement clause to be empty. This contrast is illustrated in (38).
6. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

As an interim summary, we have argued that Classical *wei* passives and *wei-suo* passives since Pre-Medieval Chinese or the Han period have structures as in (39).

(39) a. NP, wei [IP Op, [IP NP  suo, V  t, ]]
    b. NP, wei [IP Op, [IP NP  V  t, ]]
    c. NP, wei [IP Op, [IP pro  suo, V  t, ]]
    d. NP, wei [IP Op, [IP pro  V  t, ]]

*Suo* in Classical passives is a pronominal bound by the null operator. In other words, unlike *suo* in Classical relatives, it has a [-wh] feature rather than a [+wh] feature. Since this *suo*, carrying a [-wh] feature, is a newly developed entity in Han, an issue then arises whether emergence of this [-wh] *suo* in Han entails that *suo* loses its [+wh] feature even in relatives ever since. If it is indeed the case, then we will expect *suo* not to be required in object relativization after Han. This prediction is, however, not borne out. Although subject relativization without *suo* is quite common, it appears to be a robust generalization that object relativization requires the presence of *suo*.
regardless of whether the relative has an explicit or a general head noun. We searched texts in different historical periods contained in the Classical Chinese corpus of Academia Sinica and found only one instance ((40)) in Jing Hua Yuan from the Qing dynasty, which does not require *suo* in object relativization.

(40) 妹子纔說之話 (鏡花緣，第八五回)
meizi cai shuo zhi hua (Jinghuayuan. Di Bashiwu Hui)
sister just say ZHI word
‘the words that the sister just said’

The result of the corpus search thus shows that *suo* carries the [+wh] feature in Classical relatives after Han. We propose that the *suo* in Classical passives is a separate lexical item from the one in Classical relatives, both being pronominal clitics in category but bearing different *wh* feature values. At this point, it is necessary to note that this claim is the major point that crucially differentiates the analysis of the wei-*suo* passives proposed here and the analysis proposed by Pulleyblank (1987, 1995).

According to Pulleyblank, both the “wei + N + V” passives and the “wei + N + *suo* + V” passives have a pivot construction. *Wei* is a matrix verb taking an NP object and a clausal object. In the *wei* passives without *suo*, the V in the clausal object has non-overt subject and object, which are deleted due to coreference; in the *wei* passives with *suo*, the clausal object is a headless relative containing *suo*. Our analysis and Pulleyblank’s insightful analysis share the view that the two types of passive are unified under a bi-clausal structure and that *suo* in passives should be related to its counterpart in relatives. The two analyses, however, differ in that although *suo* is treated as the same element in both passives and relatives under Pulleyblank’s account, it is analyzed as bearing different values of *wh* features under our account.

Now with the recognition of the existence of a [-wh] *suo* in Classical Chinese, we will have to rule out a derivation of Classical relatives in which *suo* is bound by a
base-generated null operator as its counterpart in Contemporary relatives. The structure of a Classical relative in (41a), along this line of reasoning, would be as (41b).

(41) a. 民所食之粟
   min suo shi zhi su
   people SUO eat ZHI barley
   ‘the barley that the people eat’

   b. \[ CP \text{Op}_i [C [民所 食 t_i] [C^0] ] 之粟_i \]
   \[ CP \text{Op}_i [C [min suo shi t_i] [C^0] ] zhi su_i \]

This structure would wrongly predict the optionality of suo in Classical relatives and has to be ruled out. Note that we can no longer claim that this derivation crashes due to the failure to check the [+wh] feature of suo through its movement into Comp. This is because Classical passives do allow a suo with the [–wh] feature. It is not clear why such suo is not allowed to occur in Classical relatives, given that the same operation is legitimate in Classical passives and Contemporary relatives in (12), repeated here as (42).

(42) \[ CP \text{Op}_i [C [renmin suo chi t_i] [C^0 de]] sumi_i \]

We would like to suggest that the contrast in the licensing of suo in (41) and (42) need not be stipulated if different functions of the “linker” between the head noun and the relative clause, i.e. zhi in Classical relatives and de in Contemporary relatives, are considered.

De and zhi cannot be treated as counterparts of each other in Contemporary and Classical Chinese. First, although de in Contemporary Chinese is compulsory in serving as the linker between a relative clause and a head noun of it as illustrated in (43),
the use of *zhi* in Classical Chinese, according to Yi (1989, 250), who follows Ma (1898), is sensitive to prosodic factors in order to create a smooth rhythm. We illustrate this point by examples cited from L. He (1992, 1996): (44a/b) with *zhi* between the relative clause and the head noun and (44c/d/e) without *zhi*.

(44) a. 得敢死之士三千人 (史记、平原君虞卿列传)
   
   de gan si zhi shi san qian ren
   
   obtain dare die ZHI soildier three thousand person (Shiji. Pingyuanjun Liezhuan)

b. 控弦之士三十万。(史记、匈奴列传)
   
   kong xian zhi shi sanshi wan (Shiji. Xiongnu Liezhuan)
   
   control bow ZHI soldier thirty remainder ten:thousands
   
   ‘The shooters amounted to more than three hundred thousands.’

c. 无食粟之马 (史记、左传襄公传五年)
   
   wu shi su zhi ma (Shiji. Zhuozhuan. Xianggong Wu Nian)
   
   no eat millet ZHI horse
   
   ‘He didn’t have horses that ate millet.’

d. 张良 .... 常为画策臣 (史记、留侯世家)
   
   Zhangliang ..... chang wei hua ce chen (Shiji. Liuhou Shijia)
   
   Zhangliang often WEI draw plan subject
   
   ‘Zhangliang often provided plans as a subject.’

e. 有势家，虽有奸如山，弗犯 (史记、酷吏列传)
   
   you shi jia, sui you jian ru shan, fu fan
   
   have power family though have dirty-deeds like mountain not disturb
   
   ‘Regarding the powerful families, even though their dirty deeds piled as high as mountains, he never disturbed them.’ (Shiji. Kuli Liezhuan)
This contrast in optionality between de and zhi indicates that the former is required for structural reasons whereas the latter is required for prosodic factors. We propose that the different syntactic behaviors of zhi and de are captured by a suggestion made by Ting (2005), namely, that de is an overt manifestation of a complementizer like that in English (cf. D. Xu 1997) but that zhi is an element inserted at PF out of prosodic consideration. Further support of this claim comes from empty headed relatives. In Contemporary Chinese, the head noun in relative clauses may be empty but this is never attested in Classical Chinese as shown by the contrast between (45a/b). In other words, de is seemingly a marker of a free relative clause but zhi cannot be.

(45) a. chi sumi de
eat barley DE
‘the people that eat barley’

b. *食粟之
shi su zhi
eat barley ZHI
‘the people that eat barley’

If de and zhi are generated in the same way, then it is not clear why the head noun may be empty in Contemporary but not in Classical Chinese. On the other hand, if de but not zhi is a complementizer, this fact follows naturally. Suppose that every clause has to be typed or identified one way or another. For example, under Cheng’s (1991) Clausal Typing Hypothesis, a wh-question is typed by either having a wh-particle in C₀ or by fronting of a wh-word to the spec/CP. In the case of empty headed relatives, if neither de nor zhi is a complementizer, ‘typing’ of the clause would depend on the null operator in the spec position alone, which, however, being co-indexed with a non-overt head noun, would fail to type or identify the relative clause. Because de but not zhi may occur with the empty head noun, we conclude that de must be a complementizer that helps identify a relative clause whereas zhi is not.22
If this proposal is on the right tract that *de* in Contemporary relatives is an overt manifestation of the complementizer like *that* in English while *zhi* in Classical relatives does not occupy the $C^0$ position, then we can now explain why the structure with *suo* being bound by a base-generated null operator is out in Classical relatives but well-formed in Contemporary relatives. Under our proposal, they have the following structures:

(46) a. Classical Chinese: *[CP Op$_1$ [C- [民_所食 t$_i$] [C$_0$]] (之)粟]$i$

b. Contemporary Chinese: *[CP Op$_1$ [C- [renmin suo_ chi t$_i$] [C$_0$]] (zhi) su]$i$

We suggest that an account for this contrast is exactly on a pair with one, whatever it may be, proposed for the grammaticality contrast in (47).  

(47) The book *(that) I was wondering whether I would get it in the mail.

Here, crucially, a relative clause with a resumptive pronoun requires the presence of an overt complementizer. Likewise, because *de* is analyzed as a complementizer in the structure (46b), thus the relative clause with a base-generated null operator binding *suo* can be explicitly marked. The ‘linker’ *zhi* in Classical Chinese, in contrast, is not a complementizer; as a result, the structure in (46a) is not a well-formed one in generating acceptable examples like (41a). This conclusion verifies the proposed analysis that *suo* in Classical Chinese cannot be a $[-\text{wh}]$ element licensed by $\lambda$-binding but a $[+\text{wh}]$ element undergoing movement by itself.

Another issue we shall turn to concerning the paradigm in (39), repeated here as (48), is on form and function of a structure.

(48) a. NP, wei [IP Op$_1$ [IP NP su]$_i$ V t$_i$]]

b. NP, wei [IP Op$_1$ [IP NP V t$_i$]]

c. NP, wei [IP Op$_1$ [IP pro su]$_i$ V t$_i$]]
This paradigm illustrates how *suo* is licensed in *wei* passives with and without overt logical subjects. Given this paradigm, one may wonder why these patterns of *wei* passives do not have the same frequency of occurrence. As pointed out by Peyraube (1989), citing Y. Tang (1987), among all the occurrences of passives, the percentage of ‘*wei*+NP+V’ vs that of ‘*wei*+NP+*suo*+V’ is 21% vs 21% in the Former Han and 7% vs 52% in the Late Han. How is there such a difference in their frequency of use? We will argue that this question does not jeopardize the proposed analysis of the licensing of *suo* illustrated by the structures in (48). Rather, this question should be answered by considering a functional perspective of these patterns. We concur with Fukushima (2004) that a formal account provides descriptions and explanations for structural possibilities whereas a functional account explains why certain forms are chosen or preferred over others for various purposes defined by this approach.

In describing the development of the form ‘*wei*+NP+*suo*+V’, Wei (1994) points out that ‘*wei*+NP+V’ is not as much used as ‘*wei*+NP+*suo*+V’, because in comparison with the clear passive sense carried by the latter, the former is ambiguous between a passive and a non-passive reading, thus resulting in the language users’ preference for the latter. According to him, the reason why ‘*wei*+NP+*suo*+V’, in turn, got to be replaced by other forms of passives such as ‘*bei*+NP+V’ is also due to the fact that even more new usages of *wei* emerged in Early Medieval Chinese, which results in ambiguous interpretations of this pattern and thus its subsequent replacement by a pattern with a more clear passive sense. Similarly, we suppose that the rare occurrence of the form ‘*wei*+*suo*+V’ as observed by Peyraube (1989) and Wei (1994) may be attributed to two factors; first, in real use of language, the omission of the logical subject in Classical Chinese needs to be supported by an appropriate context and second, there is an unequivocal form available to denote short passives, namely, ‘*jian*+V’ at the time. As a result, despite its well-formedness, the pattern ‘*wei*+*suo*+V’ is not chosen by speakers as much due to some constraints related to various purposes in communication. Given this perspective, then the
proposed analysis of *suo* correctly describes and explains in what structures it is licensed as shown in (48); the occurrence frequency of each pattern, however, should be attributed to functional considerations, which is beyond the scope of this paper.\textsuperscript{25}

Last but not least is the question how the *bei* passives in Classical Chinese are treated under the proposed analysis obtained from the *wei* passives. Given the fact that the *bei* passives also exhibit a parallel paradigm like *wei* passives during their development\textsuperscript{26} as exemplified in (49),\textsuperscript{27} we claim that the proposed analysis naturally extends to the *bei* passives in Classical Chinese. In other words, the structures in (50) are suggested to underlie the examples in (49).\textsuperscript{28,29}

\begin{align*}
(49) \text{a. } & \text{{常被元帝所使(颜氏家训、杂艺)}} \\
& \text{chang bei Yuan di suo shi (Yanshi Jiaxun. Zayi)} \\
& \text{often BEI Yuan emperor SUO order} \\
& \text{‘He was often ordered around by Emperor Yuan.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{{亮子被苏峻害(世说新语、方正)}} \\
& \text{Liangzi bei Sujun hai (Shishuoxinyu. Fangzheng)} \\
& \text{Liangzi BEI Sujun kill} \\
& \text{‘Liangzi was killed by Su Jun.’} \\
\text{c. } & \text{{直言苦谏，皆被所杀(三国演义、第120回)}} \\
& \text{zhi yan ku jian, jie bei suo sha} \\
& \text{straight word bitter advise all BEI SUO kill} \\
& \text{‘Those who advised with straightforward words were all killed.’} \\
& \text{(Sanguo Yanyi. Di Yibaiershi Hui)} \\
\text{d. } & \text{{孔融被收中外惶怖(世说新语、德行)}} \\
& \text{Kongrong bei shou zhong wai huangbu} \\
& \text{Kongrong BEI put-under-custody interior exterior frighten} \\
& \text{‘Kong Rong was put under custody and everyone inside and outside the household was frightened.’ (Shishuoxinyu. Dexing)} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(50) \text{a. } & \text{NP, bei [IP Op, [IP NP suo, V t_i ]]} \\
\text{b. } & \text{NP, bei [IP Op, [IP NP V t_i ]]}
\end{align*}
7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

To recapitulate, the main claim we have made in this article is that the particle *suo* in Classical passives is an A'-bound pronominal clitic and is thus a variable in nature. In this respect, it is not different from its counterpart in Contemporary relatives and passives. However, its counterpart in Classical relatives undergoes further I⁰ to C⁰ movement and is thus an operator by itself. This account provides a new perspective on the long-lasting dispute over whether it is the same *suo* that occurs in Classical relatives and passives: the two *suo’s* are both pronominal clitics undergoing N⁰ to I⁰ movement and only differ minimally in the wh feature they carry. Crucially, their occurrence is licensed by an A'-configuration, which is provided by relatives and passives in Chinese. This also echoes L. Wang’s (1958) suggestion that it is not ‘accidental’ for the occurrence of *suo* to precede a transitive verb in a passive construction. But we consider that the structural similarity shared by these two constructions is not solely a transitive verb preceded by *suo* as claimed by L. Wang but an A'-configuration in common. ³⁰

By implementing the principle and parameter approach, we also hope that this study has proved to have “applied new theoretical tools and brought the grammar of Classical Chinese into the linguistic mainstream instead of being in a rather esoteric backwater” (Pulleyblank 1995, xiv). Significantly, general principles of Universal Grammar (e.g. the ECP) and parametric differences between Contemporary and Classical Chinese (e.g. the overtness of the subject in the ECM clause and the grammatical status of the ‘linker’ between a relative clause and its head noun) interact to derive the various syntactic behaviors of *suo* in different constructions in Contemporary and Classical Chinese.

NOTES

1. I would like to express my gratitude to Alain Peyraube for his support for my
research on Classical Chinese grammar under a formalist perspective. I wish to thank Yafei Li for constant support and for discussion of a particular point. Thanks also go to Miao-ling Hsieh for her comments on an earlier draft. My gratitude is extended to Peiquan Wei for encouraging support. I am also grateful to the anonymous referee for valuable comments and suggestions. An earlier version of this article was presented at the 16th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics, University of Iowa, USA. I thank the audience for their questions and comments. Lastly, my gratitude goes to Susan Babcock from the Academic Paper Editing Clinic, National Taiwan Normal University. Mistakes are exclusively my own. Research for this article was supported by NSC grant #92-2411-H-003-038.

2. The term Classical Chinese or gu han yu ‘old Chinese’ in the term of Yang and He (1992) roughly refers to Chinese used before the Contemporary period. We adopt the chronological framework posited by Peyraube (1989, 1996) as listed below.

   Pre-Archaic Chinese: Language of the oracle bone inscriptions. 14th-11th c. B.C.
   Early Archaic Chinese: 10th-6th c. B.C.
   Late Archaic Chinese: 5th – 2nd c. B.C.
   Pre-Medieval: 1st c. B.C. – 1st c. A.D.
   Early Medieval: 2nd – 6th c.
   Late Medieval: 7th-mid-13th c.
   Pre-Modern: mid-13th-14th c.
   Modern: 15th-mid-19th c.
   Contemporary: mid 19th –20th c.

3. Some studies, e.g. Z. Zhang (1996), only focus on the analysis of suo in Classical relatives.

4. The only exception, to my knowledge, is X. Zhu (1996), who, despite analyzing suo as a pronoun in both relatives and passives, regards the wei-suo passives as true passives.

5. The only exception, to my knowledge, is Yang and He (1992), who treat suo in relatives as a construction particle.
6. Examples in (5) are taken from Yao (1999).

7. For specific arguments, see Yao (1999) for details. But note that the one based on retained objects can be rejected by Wei’s (1994) analysis treating V plus the retained object as one lexical verb.

8. Due to space constraint, characters for contemporary Chinese will not be provided throughout this article.

9. A derivational relation between them is claimed by L. Wang (1958) and Peyraube (1989) whereas an opposing view is advocated by Yao (1999).

10. If \textit{suo} is optional in Classical passives, a question arises why \textit{wei} passives with \textit{suo} outnumbered those without \textit{suo}. We consider that some functional rather than grammatical factors are involved. We will come back to this in section 6.

11. Due to limitation on space, only some major arguments are reviewed here. See Ting (2003, 2005) for a more complete set of arguments.

12. The status of \textit{zhi} will be further discussed in section 6.

13. After the completion of this article, we ran into two instances reported by Wei (1990/2004, 328) that apparently have co-occurrence of \textit{suo} and a co-indexed pronoun.

(i) a. 置之平林，又为人所收取之。（诗生民，毛传）
   zhi zhi pinglin you wei ren suo shouqu zhi
   *(They) put him in the forest and he was adopted by people.*

b. 乃为天下所同心而归之。（诗文王郑笺）
   nai wei tianxia suo tong xin er gui zhi
   *(He) was submitted to by the world with willingness.*

We actually did not find the original text from which (ib) is said to be taken. This sequence need not be interpreted as a passive construction. For example, it may mean that he became the person who the world shares the willingness to submit to. Similarly, Shao-yu Jiang (p.c. May 2006) interpreted the ‘\textit{wei} NP’ in (ib) as a benefactive phrase rather than as introducing a logical subject in a passive
construction. Regarding (ia), both Shao-yu Jiang and Alain Peyraube (p.c. May 2006) agreed that such an instance seems to be a *guli*, that is, an isolated example in the grammar of Classical Chinese. Since this is an isolated example, we will just put it aside for now. What we have found of significance is that with both *zhi* and *suo* being popular during the same period, their occurrence together should be automatic, if they were truly allowed. Therefore, we doubt as to whether such sentences would be permitted by UG, in principle.

14. Wei (1994, 307) also argues that *wei* in the *wei-suo* passives cannot be a preposition.

15. A further argument against *wei* as an auxiliary comes from the fact that *wei* assigns an experiencer theta-role to the grammatical subject of it. Thus it must be a verb. See the discussion later in this section.

16. Following Kitagawa and Kuroda (1992), the term ‘Eventuality’ is adopted from Bach (1986) to cover both events and states. Also see their paper for the same argument structure proposed for the Japanese passive morpheme *rare*.

17. With thanks to Koji Hoshi for constructing these Japanese examples for us.

18. However, we would like to acknowledge a logical possibility that such sentences may be acceptable under the interpretation of *wei* as a (semi-)copula. As pointed out by Yao (1999), in addition to being associated with a passive sense, *wei* may also be a (semi-)copula in a *wei-suo* construction as in (i).

(i) 我为天之所欲, 天亦为我所欲 (墨子、天志)

   wo wei tian zhi suo yu, tian yi wei wo suo yu (Mozi. Tianzhi)

   ‘I am what the heaven desires for; the heaven is also what I desire for.’

19. To the best of our knowledge, the labels of long and short passives were first adopted by Ting (1995). This point is also noticed by S. Tang (2003, 166).

20. The account for the ill-formed structure in (37), which contains *suo* in a short *bei* passive, straightforwardly goes against S. Tang’s (2001, 2003) proposal. Therein it is claimed that if the complement clause is an infinitive, then the embedded subject simply cannot be a pro. It is, however, not clear to us, how this conclusion is derived.
Actually, the fact that the so-called pivotal NP in Chinese has to be overt has been puzzling for a long time (see e.g. A. Li 1989 for an analysis). As shown by the contrast (i), an embedded subject in the ECM construction may undergo movement in languages such as English but not in Chinese.

(i) a. John, we believe __ to be a hero.
   b. *Zhangsan, wo rang __ mai shu.

   Zhangsan I let buy book
   ‘Zhangsa, I let him buy a book.’

Thus, the constraint on the overtness of the “pivotal NP” in Contemporary Chinese appears to be a language specific one. It is inapplicable not only in languages such as English but also in Classical Chinese.

21. With thanks to the anonymous reviewer for pointing out these two works to me.

22. It has been noted (e.g. Yuan 1995, Yu and Zhitian 1999, Jiang 2000) that de in Contemporary Chinese comes from di (底) in Late Medieval Chinese. The syntactic distribution of di and that of zhi has been compared by researchers interested in the origin of di, most notably Lu (1984) (see also B. Zhang 1915, L. Wang 1958, Feng 2000, Jiang 2000). There seems to be a consensus that di has a distribution equivalent to that of zhi plus that of zhe. We agree with Jiang (2000) that syntactic distributions may not be a decisive factor in determining the historical relation between two elements. In other words, identical syntactic distributions of two elements do not necessarily entail that they are historically related in any way. Therefore, we will not consider whether de and zhi are historically related. For our purposes here, what is relevant is that de and zhi have different syntactic statuses in Contemporary and Classical Chinese. Furthermore, with connection to the particle di (底), Peiquan Wei (pc. June 2005) pointed out that it seems to be the case that as di emerged, the requirement for suo in object relativization was relaxed. This is exactly the prediction our analysis would make. Future research is needed to confirm it.

23. One possible explanation for this contrast provided by Rizzi (1990, p. 124) is to assume that the explicit marking on a relative must be done as being predicated by the head. This explicit marking, however, can be done by the null operator when the
movement strategy is used but not when the resumptive strategy is used. As a result, this explicit marking, according to Rizzi, must be done by the A-agreement between the head noun and an A-agreeing form of $C^0$, which, in his theory, is the overt complementizer \textit{that}.

24. Note that short passives in Contemporary Chinese and in English do not involve such a pro that needs a proper context for its recoverability.

25. An account along a similar line from the functional perspective is provided by Peyraube (1996) for why there was a need to have two new passive forms \textit{wei} and \textit{jian} when there was already one, namely \textit{yu}. The two reasons for \textit{yu}'s being unsatisfactory are that “passives in \textit{yu} were often ambiguous” and that “passives in \textit{yu} did not allow the expression of a passive without agent.”(p. 175)

26. The development of the \textit{bei} passives in Classical Chinese has been investigated extensively in the literature. See e.g. Peyraube (1989) and Wei (1994). In essence, the \textit{bei} forms gained a predominant place in Late Medieval or under the Tang and have continued to be the main passive forms ever since.

27. Except for (49c) taken from S. Li (1994), the other examples in (49) are taken from Peyraube (1989).

28. A potential problem posed by the example in (i) noticed in note 9 of Ting (1998) and also by (49c) in the text is now only an apparent one.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(i)] 必被所擒 （三国演义）
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item bi bei suo qin (Sanguo Yanyi)
\item definitely BEI SUO capture
\item ‘(Someone) definitely will be captured.’
\end{itemize}

It is reasonable to assume that the overtness constraint on the subject of the ECM clause is not at work at this historical stage of Chinese.

29. The retained object construction, which holds for \textit{bei} passives in Contemporary Chinese in (ia), is also attested for \textit{wei} passives ((ib)), as pointed out by L. He (1992), and \textit{bei} passives ((ic)) in Classical Chinese, as pointed out by Peyraube (1989).

\begin{itemize}
\item[(i)] a. Zhangsan bei qiang-le yi qian kuai.
\end{itemize}

Zhangsan BEI rob-ASP one-thousand buck
‘Zhangsan was robbed of a thousand bucks.’

b. 及为收帑，朕甚不取。（史记、孝文本纪）
   ji wei shou      tang      zhen      shen      bu qu (Shiji. Xiaowen Benji)
   and WEI confiscate property      I       very       not agree
   ‘And their property got confiscated. I, as an emperor, do not agree with it.’

c. 旋被流沙剪断根（敦煌变文集、王昭君变文）
   xuan bei liusha      jian-duan gen (Duhuang Bianwenji. Wangzhaojun)
   soon BEI moving-sand cut-off      root
   ‘Soon (its) roots were cut by the moving sand.’

Just as Thompson’s (1973) inner object analysis is applied to bei passives in Contemporary Chinese, so it is to wei and bei passives in Classical Chinese.

30. This also means that we do not consider that functional consideration of expressing a clear passive sense by marking the passive verb with suo (e.g. in Peyraube 1989) is the only, even though an important, factor responsible for the emergence of suo in a passive construction.
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論古汉语被动句所字结构之句法分析

丁仁

國立臺灣師範大學，臺灣

提要

本文研究古汉语被动句之所字结构，希望厘清前人对于关系子句及被动句中的所字是否为同一成分这个争议。我们比较所字在古汉语被动句与古汉语关系子句及现代汉语关系子句、被动句的句法表现，论证古汉语被动句的所与古汉语关系子句的所虽同样必须出现于A’的句法环境中，且都须由N提升至I，但前者不会在逻辑形式进一步由I提升至C。因此我们主张古汉语被动句的所为变量，而非运符。同时，我们也讨论了此分析对古汉语不带施事者的被动句及引介关系子句的连词的蕴含意义。
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