THE NATURE OF THE PARTICLE *SUO* IN THE PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS
IN CLASSICAL CHINESE[1]

**Jen Ting**

*National Taiwan Normal University*

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this article is to determine the syntactic nature of the particle *suo* 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 $N^0$ to $I^0$ movement. Crucially, however, *suo* does not undergo further $I^0$ to $C^0$ 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 *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. 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 *suo* 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 *suo*, 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.[2] 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

    ER    speak reach SUO hide ZHI    thing (Hanfeizi. Shuonan)

    '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<u>为江充所败</u>（汉书、霍光传）

Wei taizi <u>wei Jiangchong suo bai</u> (Hanshu. Huoguang Zhuan)

Wei prince WEI Jiangchong SUO defeat

'The Prince of Wei was defeated by Jiangchong.'

d. 不者，若属皆且<u>为所掳</u>（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<u>为所杀</u>（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 $N^0$ to $I^0$ movement. Crucially, however, *suo* does not undergo further $I^0$ to $C^0$ 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 *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 *suo*, we argue for the true passive status for the form '*wei* (+NP)+ V' and the form '*wei* (+NP) + *suo* V' in Section 3. In Section 4, we consider the analysis of *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 *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 *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 *suo* results in turning the whole *suo* V sequence into a nominal, which is construed as an object, locative, reason or manner expression associated with the predicate preceded by *suo*.

Among the analyses that address the question of *suo*'s licensing in the *wei* constructions,[3] there are also two lines. One approach is to treat *suo* in such constructions as the *suo* in relatives. In other words, *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 *wei-suo* forms are generally construed in line with Ma's (1898) interpretation.[4] That is, a *wei-suo* form is *wei* + a free relative clause containing *suo*; *wei* is treated either as a copula *to be* (Ma 1898, Chou 1959), or as a semi-copula *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,[5] 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.

**3.** THE PASSIVE STATUS OF THE FORM '*WEI* (+NP)+V' AND OF THE FORM '*WEI* (+NP)+*SUO*+V'

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)  a. 管蔡为戮 （左传、襄公二十一年）

      Guan Cai wei   lu (Zuozhuan. Xianggong Ershiyi Nian)

      Guan Cai WEI kill

      'Guan and Cai were killed.'

   b. 唯女子与小人为难养也（论语、阳货）

      wei nuzi   yu  xiaoren         wei   nan    yang   ye

      only woman and near-sighted:people WEI difficult get:alone YE

      'Only women and near-sighted people are hard to get along with.'

      (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)  a. 然后身死国亡，为天下大僇 （荀子、非相）

      ranhou shen   si    guo      wang, wei   tianxia da   lu (Xunzi. Feixiang)

      then   body   die country   die    WEI   world big shame

      'Then when he died and his state was lost, he was laughed at by the world.'

   b. 身死国亡，为天下之大僇 （荀子、强国）

      shen si   guo      wang, wei   tianxia zhi da   lu (Xunzi. Qiangguo)

      body die country die     WEI   world ZHI big shame

      '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 *lu* (戮（僇）) "to humiliate", *xiao* (笑) "to laugh at", *yong* (用) "to use", *qin* (擒) "to catch", *yi* (役) "to serve" and *shi* (使) "to make", to which *ci* (赐) "to grant", *zhi* (制) "to control", *huo* (获) "to capture", *lu* (虏) "to take prisoner" and *li* (隶) "to take enslave" are added by Reynolds (1996). This limitation on productivity thus casts doubt on the analysis of the form '*wei* (+NP)+V' as true passives. If these arguments provided by Wei, Reynolds and Yao are valid, then it indicates that the form '*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 '*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 '*wei* (+NP)+V' pattern can be occupied by a pronoun co-referential with the grammatical subject in Han as in (7).

(7) 今（吾子）为赤帝子斩<u>之</u>，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 WEI red emperor son behead ZHI so　cry

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

If *wei* is a (semi-)copula, there seems to be no easy way to nominalize the following string containing the pronoun *zhi*. A more natural analysis is thus that sentences like (7) are true passives.

　　 We shall now turn to the *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.[7] We provide additional arguments in support of analyzing the *wei-suo* forms as true passives based on their eventuality types. Notice that those who deny the passive status of the *wei-suo* pattern either analyze *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[8]

  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.

(9)   a. ta bei Lisi   piping-le     liangge zhongtou

he BEI Lisi criticize-ASP two     hour

'He has been being criticized by Lisi for two hours.'

b. ta chengwei Lisi   piping   de   ren     liangge   zhongtou

he become   Lisi   criticize DE person two         hour

'It has been two hours since he became the person criticized by Lisi.'


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.

(11) 多多益善，何以<u>为我擒</u>?（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.[9] 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: $[_{CP}$ Op$_i$ $[_{C'}$ [renmin suo$_i$    chi t$_i$] $[_C{}^0$ de]]    sumi$_i$

                                                      people SUO eat            DE    barley

(13) Classical relatives

    a.    Before Spell-out: $[_{CP}$ [民所$_i$食t$_i$] $[_C{}^0]]$之粟$_i$

                            $[_{CP}$ [min      suo$_i$    shi t$_i$ ] $[_C{}^0]]$ zhi[12]    su$_i$

                                people SUO    eat          ZHI    barley

    b.    At LF:        $[_{CP}$ [min t'$_i$ shi t$_i$ ] $[_C{}^0$ suo$_i$]] 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 $I^0$, 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 $N^0$ to $I^0$ 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 qi 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  <u>yiqi</u>   kan de   dianying

          we    SUO together see DE   movie

          'the movie that we just saw together'

    b.  *women <u>yiqi</u>     suo kan   de   dianying

          we      together SUO see    DE   movie

    c.   ta <u>zuichu</u>   suo jingying  de   shiye

          he   originally SUO operate   DE   business

          'the business that he originally operated'

    d.  *ta suo   <u>zuichu</u>     jingying de   shiye

          he SUO originally   operate   DE   business

          'the business that he originally operated'

(17) Classical Chinese

    a. 和氏璧，天下<u>所共传</u>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 Liezhuan)

     'The Heshi jade *(is) a treasure that is unanimously recognized by the

     world.'

b. <u>伍子胥初所与俱亡</u> (史记、伍子胥列传)

  Wuzixu chu   suo  yu    ju        wang (Shiji. Wuzixu liezhuan)

  Wuzixu early SUO with   together   die

  'the people that Wuzixu died with earlier'

The $N^0$ to $I^0$ 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    <u>ta</u> 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<u>之</u>而终身也（adapted from孟子、齐人有一妻一妾）

     *liang ren    zhe   suo   yangwang <u>zhi</u> 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'

(20) a. 民 *(所)食者

    min      *(suo)     shi   zhe

    people   SUO      eat   ZHE

    'what people eat'

  b. 民 *(所)食之粟

     min      *(suo)    shi   zhi     su

     people     SUO    eat   ZHI   barley

    'the barley people eat'

  c. 民 *(所)食

    min      *(suo)     shi

    people   SUO     eat

    'what people eat'

According to Ting (2003, 2005), *suo* in Contemporary relatives is optional because it is resumptive in nature, licensed by being bound by a null operator. *Suo* 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 *suo*, is argued to follow from the claim that such movement would be blocked by the LF movement of the operator *suo* 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 *suo* proposed by Ting (2003, 2005) is on the right track, then what is the nature of *suo* in Classical passives? We shall argue that it is licensed in a way that *suo* 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<u>生</u>得，当斩（史记、匈奴列传）

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

　　　Guang WEI enemy SUO alive arrest should behead

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

　　b.　上谷太守阎志 ….. 为比能<u>素</u>所归信（三国志、刘放传注引魏氏春秋）

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

　　　Shanggu county:magistrate Yanzhi　　WEI Bineng always SUO obey

　　　'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<u>之</u>，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 WEI red emperor son behead ZHI so　cry

　　'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 $N^0$ to $I^0$ 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 $I^0$ to $C^0$ 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 *bei* construction in Contemporary Chinese first.

A bi-clausal A'-configuration of *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).

(23) Zhongguo$_i$ bei   [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$ Riben qinlue t$_i$ ]]

    Zhongguo BEI          Japan invade

    'Zhongguo was invaded by Japan.'

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 *bei* passives as in (24b). Both are hallmarks of an A'-configuration.

(24) a. Zhangsan bei   guanfu     pai   shibing   zhua-zou le

        Zhangsan BEI government send soildier 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.'

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

Under this approach, the logical subject *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    [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$ 我擒  t$_i$ ]]

he    yi wei    [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$ wo qin   t$_i$ ]]

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 N$^0$ to I$^0$ 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$_i$ bei    [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$ Riben suo$_i$    qinlue   t$_i$ ]]

China    BEI            Japan SUO    invade

'China was invaded by Japan.'

b. 卫太子$_i$ 为    [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$江充 所$_i$败  t$_i$ ]]

Wei taizi $_i$ wei    [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$ Jiangchong suo$_i$    bai t$_i$ ]]

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<u>所事孔子</u>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<u>所从坠</u>。（吕氏春秋、察今）

      shi      wu  jian zhi   suo   cong   zhui (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)?

(29) a. *此法为子夏所事孔子

　　　　*ci　fa　wei　Zixia　suo　shi　Kongzi

　　　　　this way WEI Zixia　SUO serve Confucius

　　　　'Intended: This way is affected by Zixia's using it to serve Confucius.'

　　b. *此处为吾剑所从坠

　　　　*ci chu　　wei　wu jian　　suo　cong zhui

　　　　　this place WEI my sword SUO from　fall

　　　　'Intended: This place is affected by my sword's falling from it.'


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.


(30) a. *此法$_i$　为　[$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$子夏所$_i$ V$_E$ t$_i$ 事孔子]]

　　　　*ci　fa$_i$　　　wei　[$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$ Zixia suo$_i$ V$_E$ t$_i$ shi　　Kongzi]]

　　　　　this method WEI　　　　　Zixia SUO　　serve　Confucius

　　b. *此处$_i$ 为 [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$吾剑所$_i$从t$_i$ 坠]]

　　　　*ci　chu$_i$　wei [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$ wu jian　　suo$_i$　cong t$_i$　zhui]]

　　　　　this place WEI　　　　my sword SUO from　fall


　　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).

(31) a. Zhangsan suo    fuwu de    jigou

  Zhangsan SUO serve DE organization

  'the organaization in which Zhangsan serves'

 b. *nage jigou  bei Zhangsan suo    fuwu

  that organization BEI Zhangsan SUO serve

  'Intended: That organization is served in by Zhangsan.'

This contrast can be captured if *bei* 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) *bei*: [Experiencer [ __ [Eventuality]] [16]

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

(34). The unacceptable (34b) can be attributed to the violation of the argument structure of the passive morpheme –*rare*.[17]

(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.'

b. 岱不从 ….. 果<u>为所杀</u>（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.'


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)    Dai$_i$    ….. wei    [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$ pro suo$_i$    sha    t$_i$ ]]]


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)    *Zhongguo$_i$ bei    [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$ pro suo$_i$    qinlue    t$_i$ ]]

        China      BEI              SUO    invade

        'China was invaded.'


This contrast in the licensing of *suo* in Classical and Contemporary short passives actually follows from an indepedent 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).

(38)  a. 齐候使＿＿请战 （左传、成公二年）

   Qi hou   shi     ＿＿＿ qing zhan (Zuozhuan. Chenggong Er Nian)

   Qi Duke make      ask war

   'Duke Qi made someone to ask for war.'

b *Zhangsan rang/jiao/bi __ mai naben shu

   Zhangsan let/ask/force    buy that  book

   'Zhangsan let/asked/forced someone to buy that book.'


An explanation of this structural contrast is yet to be obtained. What matters for our point here is that this structural difference is correlated with the well-formedness contrast between short passives in Contemporary and Classical Chinese.[20]


**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. $NP_i$ wei [$_{IP}$ $Op_i$ [$_{IP}$ NP   $suo_i$   V   $t_i$ ]]

    b. $NP_i$ wei [$_{IP}$ $Op_i$ [$_{IP}$ NP        V   $t_i$ ]]

    c. $NP_i$ wei [$_{IP}$ $Op_i$ [$_{IP}$ pro $suo_i$   V   $t_i$ ]]

    d. $NP_i$ wei [$_{IP}$ $Op_i$ [ $_{IP}$ pro        V   $t_i$ ]]


*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 说 之 话 (镜花缘、第八十五回)
　　　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).[21]

　　　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. $[_{CP}$ $Op_i$ $[_{C'}$ [民所$_i$食 $t_i$] $[_C{}^0]]$ 之粟$_i$

    $[_{CP}$ $Op_i$ $[_{C'}$ [min suo$_i$ 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) $[_{CP}$ $Op_i$ $[_{C'}$ [renmin suo$_i$   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),

(43) mai shu *(de) ren

buy book DE person

'the person who bought books'

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. 控弦之士三十余万。（史记、匈奴列传）

kong   xian zhi   shi     sanshi yu            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 $C^0$ 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$_i$ $[_{C'}$ [民所$_i$食  t$_i$] $[_C{}^0]]$ (之)粟$_i$

                           *$[_{CP}$ Op$_i$ $[_{C'}$ [min suo$_i$    shi    t$_i$] $[_C{}^0]]$ (zhi) su$_i$

    b. Contemporary Chinese:    $[_{CP}$ Op$_i$ $[_{C'}$ [renmin suo$_i$    chi    t$_i$] $[_C{}^0$ de]] sumi$_i$

We suggest that an account for this contrast is exactly on a par with one, whatever it may be, proposed for the grammaticality contrast in (47).[23]

(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 [–wh] element licensed by A'-binding but a [+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$_i$ wei $[_{IP}$ Op$_i$ $[_{IP}$ NP    suo$_i$    V    t$_i$ ]]

    b. NP$_i$ wei $[_{IP}$ Op$_i$ $[_{IP}$ NP            V    t$_i$ ]]

    c. NP$_i$ wei $[_{IP}$ Op$_i$ $[_{IP}$ pro suo$_i$    V    t$_i$ ]]

      d. NP$_i$ wei [$_{IP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{IP}$ pro          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[24] 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.[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[26] as exemplified in (49),[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).[28, 29]

(49) a. 常被元帝所使（颜氏家训、杂艺）

　　　chang　bei Yuan di　　　suo　shi (Yanshi Jiaxun. Zayi)

　　　often　BEI Yuan emperor SUO order

　　　'He was often ordered around by Emperor Yuan.'

　　b. 亮子被苏峻害（世说新语、方正）

　　　Liangzi bei　Sujun　hai (Shishuoxinyu. Fangzheng)

　　　Liangzi BEI　Sujun kill

　　　'Liangzi was killed by Su Jun.'

　　c. 直言苦谏，皆被所杀（三国演义、第 120 回）

　　　zhi　yan　ku　jian, jie bei suo　sha

　　　straight word bitter advise all BEI SUO kill

　　　'Those who advised with straightforward words were all killed.'

　　　(Sanguo Yanyi. Di Yibaiershi Hui)

　　d. 孔融被收中外惶怖（世说新语、德行）

　　　Kongrong bei　shou　　　　　zhong　wai　　huangbu

　　　Kongrong BEI put-under-custody interior exterior　frighten

　　　'Kong Rong was put under custody and everyone inside and outside the

　　　household was frightened.' (Shishuoxinyu. Dexing)

(50) a. $NP_i$ bei [$_{IP}$ $Op_i$ [$_{IP}$ NP $suo_i$　　V　$t_i$ ]]

　　b. $NP_i$ bei　[$_{IP}$ $Op_i$ [$_{IP}$ NP　　　V　$t_i$ ]]

c. $NP_i$ bei $[_{IP} Op_i [_{IP} pro \quad suo_i \quad V \quad t_i ]]$

d. $NP_i$ bei $[_{IP} Op_i [_{IP} pro \qquad\quad V \quad t_i ]]$

**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 $I^0$ to $C^0$ 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 $N^0$ to $I^0$ 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.

<div align="center">NOTES</div>

1. I would like to express my graditude to Alain Peyraube for his support for my

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 *suo* is optional in Classical passives, a question arises why *wei* passives with *suo* outnumbered those without *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 *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 *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

    put he forest   and WEI person SUO adopt he (Shi Shengmin. Mao Zhuan)

    '(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

    thus WEI world   SUO same heart ER return he (Shi Wenwang Zhengjian)

    Intended: '(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 '*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   WEI heaven ZHI SUO desire heaven also WEI I    SUO desire

     '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 *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 *wei* and *jian* when there was already one, namely *yu*. The two reasons for *yu*'s being unsatisfactory are that "passives in *yu* were often ambiguous" and that "passives in *yu* did not allow the expression of a passive without agent."(p. 175)

26. The development of the *bei* passives in Classical Chinese has been investigated extensively in the literature. See e.g. Peyraube (1989) and Wei (1994). In essence, the *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.

(i) 必被所擒 （三国演义）

    bi        bei suo    qin (Sanguo Yanyi)

    definitely BEI SUO capture

    '(Someone) definitely will be captured.'

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 *bei* passives in Contemporary Chinese in (ia), is also attested for *wei* passives ((ib)), as pointed out by L. He (1992), and *bei* passives ((ic)) in Classical Chinese, as pointed out by Peyraube (1989).

(i) a. Zhangsan bei qiang-le    yiqian        kuai.

    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.

## REFERENCES

BACH, E. 1986. The algebra of events. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9: 5-16.

BAKER, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation:A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

BALTIN, Mark. 1982. A landing site theory of movement rules. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 1-38.

BURZIO, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax: Government-binding Approach.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

CHAO, Yuen-Ren. 1968. *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

CHENG, L.-S. Lisa. 1991. *On the Typology of Wh-questions.* MIT dissertation.

CHOMSKY, Noam. 1986. *Barriers.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

————. 1991. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation.

    In *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, ed. by Robert Freidin, 17-454. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

CHOU, Fagao. 1959. *Zhongguo Gudai Yufa: Chengdai Bian [Grammar of Ancient Chinese: Pronouns].* Taipei: Academia Sinica.

———. 1961. *Zhongguo Gudai Yufa: Zaoju Bian [Grammar of Ancient Chinese: Syntax].* Taipei: Academia Sinica.

CHU, Chauncey G. 1987. *Historical Syntax—Theory and Application to Chinese.* Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co Ltd.

DONG, Xiufang. 1998. Chongxin fenxi yu suo zi gongneng de fazhan [Reanalysis and the development of the function of suo]. *Gu Hanyu Yanjiu [Classical Chinese Study]* 40: 50-55.

FENG, Chuntian. 2000. *Jindai Hanyu Yufa Yanjiu [Study of Late Medieval Chinese Grammar].* Shandong: Shandong Educational Publisher.

FUKUSHIMA, Kazuhiko. 2004. Conspiracy of form and function for optimization of language change. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 13: 181-196.

GONG, Qianyan. 1995. *Hanyu de Shixiang, Shizhi and Shitai. [The Modality, Tense and Aspect of Chinese].* Beijiang: Shangwu Publisher.

HE, Leshi. 1992. Shiji yufa tedian yanjiu [Study of the characteristics of grammar in Shiji]. In *Study of the Grammar of Han Period*, ed. by Xiangching Cheng, 1-261. Shandong: Shandong Educational Publisher.

———. 1996. Zuozhuan de *zhi* [The particle *zhi* in zuozhuan]. In *Gu Hanyu yanjiu*, Vol. 1, ed. by The editorial department of Gu Hanyu Yanjiu, 152-182. Beijing: Zhonghua Publisher.

HE, Rong. 1954. *Zhongguo Wenfa Lun [On Chinese Grammar].* Taiwan: Kaiming Bookstore.

HUANG, C.-T. James. 1999. Chinese passives in comparative perspective. *The Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* 29: 423-509.

JIANG, Lansheng. 2000. *Jindai Hanyu Tan Yuan [Exploring the Origin of Late Medieval Chinese].* Beijing: Shangwu Publisher.

KAYNE, Richard. 1989. Null subjects and clitic climbing. In *The Null Subject*

*Parameter*, eds. by Osvaldo Jaeggli and Kenneth J. Safir, 239-63. Dordrecht, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

KITAGAWA, Yoshi and Yuki kuroda. 1992. *Passives in Japanese*. University of Rochester and UCSD, MS.

LI, Renjian. 1982. Lue tan *suo* zi jiegou han youguan de yixie wenti [Some remarks on the *suo* constructions and related issues]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 6: 416-421.

LI, Shan. 1994. *Xiandai Hanyu bei Zi Ju Yanjiu [The Study of the Bei Construction in Contemporary Chinese]*. Beijing: Beijing Daxue Publisher.

LI, Y.-H. Audrey. 1989. Constituent constraints in Mandarin Chinese. In *Proceedings of the Third Ohio State University Conference on Chinese Linguistics,* eds. by Margorie K.M. Chan and Thomas Ernst, 189-200. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club Publications.

LIU, Fu. 1937. *Zhong Guo Wenfa Jianghua [A Grammar of Chinese]*. Shanghai: Beixin Publisher.

LIU, Yongzheng. 1990. *Suo* zi xin lun [A new analysis of the particle *suo*]. *Yuwen Yanjiu* 2: 27-31.

LU, Shu-xiang. 1984. *Hanyu Yufa Lunwen Ji [Essays on Chinese Grammar]*. Beijing: Shangwu Publisher.

MA, Jianzhong. 1898. *Mashi Wentong [Ma's Grammar]*. Beijing: Shangwu Publisher.

PEYRAUBE, Alain. 1989. History of passive construction in Chinese until the 10th Century. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 17: 335-372.

_____. 1996. Recent issues in Chinese historical syntax. *New Horizons in Chinese Linguistics*, eds. by C.-T. James Huang and Y.-H. Audrey Li, 161-214. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

POLLOCK, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365-424.

PULLEYBLANK, Edwin. 1987. Some embedding constructions in Classical Chinese. In *Wang Li Memorial Volumes: English Volume*, ed. by the Chinese Language

Society of Hong Kong, 359-356. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing Company.

———. 1995. *Outline of Classical Chinese Grammar.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

REYNOLDS, Robert. 1996. *Passives in Classical and Han Chinese: Typological Considerations.* University of Wisconsin-Madison dissertation.

RIZZI, Luigi. 1986. On the status of subject clitics in Romance. In *Studies in Romance Linguistics,* eds. by O. Jaeggli and C. Silva-Corvalin, 391-419. Dordrecht: Foris.

———. 1990. *Reletivized Minimality.* MIT Press.

SIEWIERSKA, Anna. 1984. *The Passive: A Comparative Linguistic Analysis.* Sidney, Australia: Croom Helm Ltd.

SMITH, Carlota S. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect.* Dordrecht, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

SONG, Shao-nian. 1996. Guanyu ming (dai) + *suo* + dong construction de qiefen [On the constituency of the "noun (pronoun) + *suo* + V" construction]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 2: 155-159.

TANG. Sze-Wing. 2001. A complementation approach to Chinese passives and its consequences. *Linguistics* 39: 257-295.

———. 2003. *Hanyu Fangyan Yufa de Canshu Lilun [A Parametric Theory of Chinese Dialectal Grammar].* Beijing: Beijing University Publisher.

TANG, Yu-ming. 1987. Han Wei Liuchao beidong shi lue lun. [On the passive construction in Han Wei Liuchao]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 3: 216-223.

TANG, Yuming and Xifu Zhou. 1985. Lun xian-Qin Hanyu beidong shi de fazhan. [On the development of the passive construction in pre-Qin period]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 4: 281-284.

THOMPSON, Sandra. 1973. Transitivity and the *ba* construction in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 1: 208-221.

TING, Jen. 1995. *A Non-uniform Analysis of the Passive Construction in Mandarin Chinese.* University of Rochester dissertation.

———. 1998. Deriving the *bei*-construction in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 4: 319-54.

_____. 2003. The nature of the particle *suo* in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 12: 121-39.

_____. 2005. On the syntax of the *suo* construction in Classical Chinese, *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 33.2: 233-267.

TRAVIS, Lisa. 1984. *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation.* Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.

WANG, Kezhong. 1982. Guanyu xianqin *suo* zi cixing de diaocha baogao [Research report on the category of the particle *suo* in Pre-qin period] In *Gu Hanyu Yanjiu Lunwenji [Papers of Classical Chinese Research]*, ed. by Classical Chinese department of the China Social Science Institute, 69-102. Beijing: Beijing Publisher.

WANG, Li. 1958. *Hanyu Shigao [History of the Chinese Language].* Beijing: Kexue Publisher.

WEI, Peiquan (1990/2004) *Han Wei Liuchao Chengdai Ci Yanjiu [Study of the Pronominal Elements in Han Wei Liuchao].* National Taiwan University: Doctoral dissertation. Reprinted by Linguistics Institute, Academia Sinica. 2004.

_____. 1994. Guhanyu beidongshi de fazhan yu yanbian jizhi [On the mechanism of the development and change of the passive constructions in classical Chines]. *Zhongguo Jing nei Yuyan Ji Yuyanxue* 2: 293-319.

XU, Ding. 1997. *Functional Categories in Mandarin Chinese.* Netherlands: Leiden University dissertation.

XU, Shiying. 1963. *Changyong Xuzi Yongfa Qianshi [Explanation of Usages of Common Functional Words].* Taipei: Fuxing Publisher.

YANG, Boujun and Leshi He. 1992. *Gu Hanyu Yufa Ji Qi Fazhan [Classical Chinese Grammar and Its Development].* Beijing: Yuwen Publisher.

YANG, Shuda. 1928. *Ciquan [The Interpretation of Words].* Beijing: Shangwu publisher.

YAO, Zhenwu. 1998. Gebiexing Zhicheng yu '*suo*' Zi Jiegou. *Gu Hanyu Yanjiu* 40: 45-49.

_____. 1999. Xian qin Hanyu shoushi zhuyu ju xitong [The system of the patient subject construction in late archaic Chinese]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 1: 43-53.

YI, Menchung. 1989. *Xian Qin Yufa [Pre-Qin Grammar].* Hunan: Educational Publisher.

YU, Guang-zhong and Jun Zhitian. 1999. *Jindai Hanyu Yufa Yanjiu [Study of the Grammar of Late Medieval Chinese].* Shanghai: Xuelin Publisher.

YUAN, Yulin. 1995. Weici yinhan ji qi jufa houguo—"*De*" zi jiegou de changdai guize han "*de*" de yufa, yuyi gonneng. [The covertness of predicates and its syntactic consequences—the pronominalization rule in the de construction and the grammatical, semantic function of the particle de]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 4: 241-255.

ZHANG, Binglin. 1915. Zhangshi congshu: *Xin Fangyan [Zhang's Collection: New Dialect].* Taipei: World Publisher.

ZHANG, Zhiqiang. 1996. *Suo* zi fu yi [Revisiting the particle *suo*]. In *Gu Hanyu Yanjiu* [Sutdy of Classical Chinese], vol. 1, ed. by Gu Hanyu Yanjiu Bianjibu, 229-237. Beijing: Zhonghua Publisher.

ZHU, Dexi. 1983. Zizhi yu zhanzhi [Self-reference and derivative reference]. *Fangyan* 1: 16-31.

ZHU, Xing. 1996. *Zhuxing Gu Hanyu Lunwen Xuanji [Collection of Zhu Xing's Essays].* Taipei: Hongye Publisher.

论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*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$N^0$ 提升至 $I^0$，但前者不会在逻辑形式进一步由$I^0$提升至$C^0$。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。