SEMANTICS AND SYNTAX OF
THE PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION IN HAINAN MIN*

Hui-chi Lee
National Cheng Kung University

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the syntactic and semantic features of passive structures in Hainan Min with a focus on the passive semi-lexical verb in Hainan Min, *ioh*, lexically denoting the verb 'to take.' We offer definitions and examples for the different meanings in the causative-unaccusative spectrum. The meanings of *ioh* are tested through these definitions, which revealed that *ioh* expresses meanings from 'causative' to 'passive.' In addition, this paper also provides data for examining the *ioh*-passives with reference to *there*, subject-anaphora, idiom chunks, unaccusative/causative alternation, and subject-oriented adverbs. This paper also compares the *ioh*-passive with the *hoo*-passive in Taiwan Southern Min and the *gei*-passive in Mandarin. The passive structures in the three dialects all follow the passivization cartography. In these dialects, the meanings of the passive verbs occupy several points along the causative-unaccusative spectrum, but different dialects have their specific passive verbs, each with its own range of meanings. The passive structure in Hainan Min has not yet been thoroughly studied. Hence, this paper contributes to filling the gap in the knowledge by providing both semantic and syntactic analyses.

Keywords: causative, unaccusative, take-passive, Hainan Min

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper focuses on the passive structures in Hainan Min, which is spoken on Hainan Island, located near the southernmost point of China. The people on Hainan Island mostly speak Mandarin and Hainan Min. Hainan Min is a member of the Min dialect group. Furthermore, Hainan Min is considered to be a branch of the Southern Min dialects (Yang and Xia 1992). Hainan Min has only been rarely studied compared with Mandarin and other Min dialects, and is, therefore, unfamiliar to linguists. There is some literature regarding the phonetic and lexical descriptions of Hainan Min (Chen 1996; Hashimoto 1961; Liang 1986; Woon 2004; Liu 2006), but syntactic research is very rare in the literature (e.g., Lee 2010, 2011; Qian 2002). Seeking to remedy the insufficient understanding of the language, this paper aims to provide a syntactic study of Hainan Min and to offer some data collected through our fieldwork on Hainan Island. The syntactic issue discussed in this paper is concerned with the passives in this language.

The passive voice changes the realization of the argument structure, in which the patient bears the subject relation, and the agent may occur in an oblique position. Pragmatically, the passive voice helps the speaker to avoid specifying the agent; semantically, the subject of a passive sentence is affected, and the agent is defocused; syntactically, the passive voice changes the argument structure as well as the form of the verb. That is, a canonical passive will show certain properties of both the subject and the verb. In the case of a canonical passive, the subject often occurs overtly; its thematic role is mostly a patient; and it is often not volitional or responsible for the action. In addition to the subject, the verb of a canonical passive is often formally marked; the verbal marking is synthetic rather than periphrastic; and the category of the verb is transitive and dynamic. For example, the *be*-passive in English can be understood to function as a canonical passive. On the other hand, a non-canonical passive may have a non-patient subject, and the subject may be volitional and partially responsible for the action. Meanwhile, the verb of a non-canonical passive is not formally marked; it has a periphrastic verbal marking; and the verb can be intransitive and non-dynamic. A non-canonical passive may be language-specific. For

example, the *get*-passive can be assumed to be a non-canonical passive in English. The *get*-passive behaves in a manner distinct from the *be*-passive. An important difference between these two types of passives lies in the agentivity of the subject. Pairs of examples for these two types of English passives are shown in (1) and (2).

(1)   a. *The man was burned deliberately.
        b. The man got burned deliberately.

(2)   a. *The man was hit to collect insurance money.
        b. The man got hit to collect insurance money.   (Huang 2013)

The intention conveyed by the intentional adverb and the purpose clause is associated with the subject of the *get*-sentence. The word *get* in a *get*-passive is thus assumed to be more like a lexical verb than an auxiliary verb (e.g., *be* in *be*-passives).

Hainan Min passives employ the word *ioh* to function as a semi-lexical verb in the passive, preceding the agent. The *ioh*-passive in Hainan Min is considered as an example of a non-canonical passive. Firstly, the word *ioh* is not simply a passive auxiliary; it bears its own verbal meaning—'take.' Verbal examples are shown in 2.1. Secondly, an *ioh*-passive can contain an intentional adverb referring to its subject. Examples will be shown and discussed in the following section. Thirdly, the verb of an *ioh*-passive is not formally marked. Based on these characteristics, the *ioh* passive construction in Hainan Min is considered non-canonical. The present study aims to explore the syntactic and semantic properties of *ioh*-passives in Hainan Min. Section 2 introduces the semantic meanings of the verb *ioh* and their corresponding syntactic distribution. Section 3 examines the raising analysis and the control account for *ioh*-passives. Section 4 compares the non-canonical passives in three Chinese dialects: Hainan Min, Taiwan Southern Min, and Mandarin.

Linguists remain unfamiliar with Hainan Min passive structures, although the study of Chinese passives has generated several works, e.g., Hashimoto (1987, 1988), Huang (1999, 2011, 2013), and Ting (1993, 1995, 1998). Even the fact that Hainan Min employs a taking verb to

express passives is generally unknown to linguists. Moreover, as demonstrated by the fieldwork data, the taking verb can perform both causative and passive functions in Hainan Min. The multiple functions of the verb *take* have not been clearly explored in any of the previous studies. Therefore, this paper contributes to the literature by providing data that include this special passive form (*take*-passive) and by comparing the passives in Hainan Min with other passive forms (e.g., *give*-passive).

2. THE *IOH* CONSTRUCTION

The word *ioh* expresses the passive meaning in Hainan Min. In addition to the passive usage, *ioh* can also be used as a causative semi-lexical verb, expressing 'cause,' 'let,' and 'allow.' The data concerning Hainan Min *ioh* is introduced and discussed in this section.

2.1 Verb *ioh*

The word *ioh* in Hainan Min conveys several meanings, not only at the syntactic level but also at the lexical level. The word *ioh* basically indicates 'take,' as shown in (3)-(5).[1]

---

[1] Hainan Min contains the following consonants: /ph, b, ɓ, t, d, ɗ, k, g, s, h, ɦ, ts, dz, m, n, ng, l/. Vowels include: /a, i, u, ɛ, o/. The vowel /ɛ/ is typed as 'e.' The data shown in this paper belong to the Wenchang dialect, which is the most commonly used dialect on Hainan Island. As a member of the Min dialectal group, Hainan Min shares many grammatical features of other spoken varieties of Chinese. For example, it is mostly left-headed, and the word order is SVO. Topic-comment construction is observed in Hainan Min. Subject dropping frequently occurs in colloquial situations. Serial verb constructions are also commonly used.

(3) I⁴⁴ bo²² hien²¹ gua²¹ ioh⁵ dzia¹¹ ki⁴⁴ sak³ ti¹¹ du²¹.
     3SG NEG willing 1SG take this CL chisel to 2SG
     'He did not allow me to bring the chisel to you.'

(4) Kong⁴⁴-an⁴⁴ ioh⁵ tui²¹ ak⁵ nua⁴⁴ kia²¹ se²¹.
     police take water pour decayed child waken
     'The police took water to wake the bad boy up.'

(5) I⁴⁴ bo²² tai⁴⁴ tio⁴² ioh⁵ ɗua⁴⁴ kai²², a⁴⁴ ti⁴²
     3SG NEG know think take big MOD or be
     tio⁴² ioh⁵ niauh⁵ kai²².
     think take small MOD
     'He does not know whether to take the big one or to take the small one.'

The meaning of the word *ioh* may be extended from simply 'take' to 'take somebody to be chosen as,' as in (6)-(7).

(6) Lau42-ɓan21 na42 ɦam11 gua21-mui22 ioh5 dziak³ kai²²
     boss only call 1PL take one CL
     nang²² hu¹¹.
     people go
     'The only thing the boss told us was to pick one of us to go.'

(7) Dua⁴⁴-ke⁴⁴ ioh⁵ i⁴⁴ toh⁵ ɗai⁴²-ɓiau²¹.
     everyone take 3SG do representative
     'We chose him as the representative.'

The word *ioh* lexically indicates 'take,' 'use,' and 'pick.' At the syntactic level, it can also express 'causative' and 'passive.'

2.2 Causative *ioh*

Ioh also functions as a causative semi-lexical verb that indicates 'cause,' 'let,' and 'allow.' The 'cause' usage denotes 'to cause

something to happen or occur, not always intentionally,' as shown in (8)-(10).

(8) Ho^{11} kien^{42} se^{42} ioh^5 gua^{21} hau^{22} hia^{11}.
     that   CL   matter   cause   1SG   head   ache
     'That matter gives me a headache.'

(9) Dzia^{11} kien^{42} se^{42} ioh^5 gua^{21}-mui^{22} na^{42}-ku^{11} kam^{21}-hang^{42}.
     this   CL   matter cause 1PL   very   touched
     'The story makes us feel touched.'

(10) I^{44} kong^{21} kai^{22} ue^{44} ioh^5 i^{44} na^{42}-ku^{11} kau^{44}-ꞓeng^{11}.
     3SG   say   GEN   word cause 3SG   very   glad
     'His words made him very happy.'

The 'allow' usage denotes 'to give permission, to permit to be attainable,' as in (11)-(14). The agentivity of the subject renders *ioh* to be interpreted as 'allow.'

(11) Du^{21} ꞓe^{42}-na^{44} ho^{21}-dzi^{21} ioh^5 i^{44} dziop^3 lai^{22}.
     2SG   now   may   allow   3SG   enter   come
     'Now you may allow him to enter.'

(12) Tsiah^3 ta^{21}-san^{44} au^{42}, gua^{21} tsiu^{42} ioh^5 i^{44}-nang^{22}
     eat   breakfast   after 1SG   then   allow 3PL
     sut^5 hu^{11} nam^{11}.
     exit   go   play
     'After breakfast, I allow them to go out and play.'

(13) Kio^{22} hai^{11} lua^{42},   i^{44} bo^{22} ioh^5 nih^5-kia^{21} tsiah^3.
     eggplant too   spicy   3SG   NEG allow   little kid   eat
     'The eggplant is too spicy; he does not allow the child to eat it.'

(14) Du²²-tsi²¹   bo²² ioh⁵   gua²¹ si¹¹   dzia¹¹ ɓua²² sai¹¹.
     cook   NEG allow   1SG   taste this   plate vegetable
     'The cook did not allow me to taste the dish.'

The 'let' usage denotes 'to make it possible for something to happen through a specific action,' as in (15) and (16).

(15) I⁴⁴   kong²¹ dziak³ kai²² ku¹¹-se⁴²   ioh⁵ gua²¹   hia⁴⁴.
     3SG   talk   one   CL   story   let 1SG   listen
     (Lit.) 'He told a story to let me listen.'
     'He told me a story.'

(16) Bo²² dziong⁴² ioh⁵ ɦia⁴²   tau²¹ dziop³ ɓua²² lai⁴².²
     NEG use   let   ant   run   enter   plate inside
     'Do not let the ants get onto the plate.'

It is also possible for the word 'let' to denote 'passive allowance, passive causativity,' that is, when one allows things to happen through a lack of action. For example, in (16), if the addressee does not take any action to prevent the ants from getting onto the plate, he/she will probably witness the ants getting onto the plate. This more or less voluntary observation can also be expressed by *ioh* in Hainan Min.

2.3 Passive *ioh*

The passive semi-lexical verb used in Hainan Min is *ioh*, which indicates '*undergo*' and '*be affected by*.' Examples are as follows.

(17) I⁴⁴   mo⁴² mak³ ioh⁵ nang²² uat³ sa⁴⁴-me²² hu¹¹ la¹¹.
     3SG CL eye PASS people dig   blind   go   PART
     'His eyes were dug out by someone which caused him to go blind.'

---

² *Bo²² dziong⁴²* in Hainan Min corresponds to *bu² yao⁴* in Mandarin. The meaning of the term *bo²² dziong⁴²* is 'do not,' which indicates a negative imperative.

(18) Dzia^{11}mo^{42} uan^{22}-phue^{22}lau^{21} ioh^5 gua^{21} kua^{21} tau^{21} la^{11}.
this CL naughty person PASS 1SG expel run PART
'This naughty boy was expelled by me.'

(19) Gua^{21} kai^{22} tu^{44} ioh^5 nang^{22} hau^{44} tau^{21} la^{11}.
1SG GEN book PASS people steal run PART
'My book was stolen by someone.'

The agent of the action immediately follows the word *ioh*. Unlike Mandarin *bei*-passives,[3] Hainan Min passives do not allow the omission of the agent, as in (20)-(22).

(20) a. Hu^{22} ioh^5 *(niau^{44}) tsiah^3 hu^{11} la^{11}. (Hainan Min)
fish PASS cat eat go PART
'The fish was eaten by the cat.'
b. Yu^2 bei^4 (mao^1) chi^1 le^0.[4] (Mandarin)
fish PASS cat eat PERF
'The fish was eaten by the cat.'

(21) a. I^{44} mo^{42} siu^{21} ioh^5* (nang^{22}) phah^5 (Hainan Min)
3SG CL hand PASS people hit
tiang^{44} la^{11}.
hurt PART
'His hand was hit by someone and got hurt.'
b. Ta^1 shou^3 bei^4 (ren^2) da^3 shang^1 le^0. (Mandarin)
3SG hand PASS people hit hurt PERF
'His hand was hit by someone and got hurt.'

---

[3] *Bei*-passives have been widely discussed in the literature (e.g., Chu 1973; Chiu 1993; Ting 1993, 1995, 1998; Shi 1997; Huang 1999, 2011, 2014; Tang 2001; Shi and Hu 2005).
[4] The tone diacritics for Mandarin are presented in terms of tone number. Their corresponding pitch values are: 1-high flat, 2-rising, 3-contour, 4-falling, and 0-light.

(22) a. Ho^{11} mo^{42} o^{21}-te^{44} ioh^5 *(nang^{22})   (Hainan Min)
          that   CL   student   PASS   people
          kua^{21} sut^5 iau^{42}.
          expel exit   school
          'That student was expelled from the school.'
      b. Na^4 ge^0 xue^2-sheng^1 bei^4 (ren^2) gan^3 (Mandarin)
          that   CL   student   PASS people expel
          chu^1 xue^2-xiao^4.
          exit   school
          'That student was expelled from the school.'[5]

In addition, *ioh*-passives can co-occur with subject-oriented adverbs, as in (23) and (24).

(23) Gua^{21} dziak^3-kang^{44} ioh^5 i^{44} phah^5.[6]
      1SG   purposely   PASS   3SG   hit
      'I got hit by him purposely.'

(24) I^{44} dzuan^{42}-i^{11} ioh^5 gua^{21} uang^{21}.
      3SG   willing   PASS   1SG   cheat
      'He was willing to get cheated by me.'

---

[5] A reader of this paper pointed out that *ioh* is similar to the Mandarin *jiao* and *rang* causatives which must co-occur with an agent when used as passive markers. Tang (2001) also supports this idea and further assumes that *rang* and *jiao* undergo grammaticalization. In addition, *rang* is more lexical than *jiao*. The lexical-functional spectrum is *rang* > *jiao* > *bei*. According to Tang (2001), *jiao* is not well accepted with a volitional adverb (e.g., *guyi* 'intentionally'), while *rang* is allowed. If this co-occurrence with adverbs is taken into consideration, *ioh* is more similar to *rang*. That is, *ioh* mainly remains in the lexical category. *Ioh* behaves more like a verb than a grammatical morpheme.

[6] This sentence, as well as (24), is ambiguous. It can be interpreted either as a passive or as a causative reading, as 'I got hit by him purposely' or 'I let him hit me purposely.' When a language consultant is asked to yield a Hainan Min sentence, corresponding to *wo bei ta da le* 'I was hit by him' in Mandarin, he utters *gua ioh i phah* 'I was hit by him.' This fact indicates that *ioh* is interpreted as a passive marker. Furthermore, without any given contexts, the sentence *gua ioh i phah* is often interpreted as passive rather than causative.

In summary, *ioh* can perform three functions: as a lexical verb indicating 'take'; a semi-lexical verb indicating 'cause,' 'let,' and 'allow'; and a semi-lexical verb indicating 'undergo' and 'be affected by.' In addition to the semantic meanings of *ioh*, the next section will discuss the syntactic structure of the *ioh*-passive.

3. *TAKE*-PASSIVES: RAISING OR CONTROL

This section discusses the syntactic account for the passive structure in Hainan Min. Recent studies have sparked a debate over the analysis of *get*-passives. One side supports the raising account, and the other side supports the control analysis (cf. Alexiadou 2005; Fox and Grodzinsky 1998; Haegeman 1985). The raising analysis of the *get*-passive syntax is shown in (25) and the control analysis in (26).

(25)   John$_i$ got [t$_i$ kicked t$_i$ by Eric].   Raising analysis

(26)   John$_i$ got [PRO$_i$ kicked t$_i$ by Eric].   Control analysis

Similarly, there are two competing lines of research on Chinese passives: movement vs. complementation (e.g., Li 1985, 1990; Hashimoto 1969, 1987; Wang 1970; Travis 1984; Wei 1994). The raising/movement approach claims that the subject of a passive sentence is derived from the movement of the internal argument, while the control/predication approach argues that it is not. Although the arguments about control and raising still continue, some mixed analyses have started to draw the attention of linguists. For example, Huang (1999, 2014) and Huang et al. (2009) propose that the Chinese *bei*-passive allows for both a control and a raising analysis. The long passive in Chinese imposes a semi-lexical verb *bei*, which is complemented by a null operator construction,[7] akin to the *tough* construction in English. On the other hand, the null operator construction involves a raising movement, akin to the *be*-passive in English. The syntax of the *bei*-

---

[7] The null operator account is also proposed and supported by Chiu (1993), Tsai (1995), Feng (1997), Ting (1998), and Cheng et al. (1999).

passive analyzed by Huang (1999) and Huang et al. (2009) is shown in (27).[8]

(27) Zhangsan$_i$ bei [OP$_i$ [Lisi da-le t$_i$]]
        predication   movement
      'Zhangsan was hit by Lisi'

The discussion on the raising vs. the control analysis of the Chinese *bei*-passive will be examined here as we consider the Hainan Min data.

3.1 Control *ioh*-Passives

Four syntactic characteristics of the *ioh*-passive support the control relationship between the argument in the subject position and the verb *ioh*: (i) subject-oriented adverbs, (ii) long-distance passivization, (iii) non-constituency of the [*ioh* NP] sequence, and (iv) subject anaphora.[9]

Firstly, subject-oriented adverbs can be predicated on the subject of *ioh*-passive sentences.

(28) I^{44} dziak^3-kang^{44} ioh^5 nang^{22} phah^5.
      3SG   intentionally   PASS   people   hit
      'He intentionally got hit by people.'

The fact that the argument in the subject position bears a thematic role violates the movement hypothesis, which assumes that the subject position of a passive sentence lacks a thematic role. The theme object undergoes an NP-movement to shift to the subject position. However, the subject in Hainan Min passives can bear the agent role rather than the theme or the patient role. The subject of *ioh* passive is thus considered to be in a thematic position.

---

[8] Huang et al. (2009) explain the predication and control analysis. They state in Footnote 23 on p.138, "Predication and control are clearly of the same or similar nature. In Williams (1980), control is simply treated as a special case of (secondary) predication."
[9] These four issues are often considered when Chinese linguists deal with passives (e.g., Huang et al. 2009).

In addition, long-distance passives in Mandarin are island-sensitive (Huang 1999; Huang et al. 2009). Without the resumptive pronoun *ta* '3SG,' the long-distance passive sentence is not acceptable, as in (29). Likewise, *ioh*-passives also exhibit island sensitivity, as in (30).

(29) Zhangsan   bei   wo   tongzhi   Lisi   ba   zanmei   *(ta)
     Zhangsan   PASS   1SG   inform   Lisi   BA   praise   3SG
     de   shu   dou   mai-zou   le.
     MOD   book   all   buy-go   PERF
     'Zhangsan had me inform Lisi to buy up all the books that praise (him).'

(Huang 1999: (30))

(30) Tsiang^{44}-ta^{44} ioh^5 gua^{21} hong^{44}-tai^{44} Li^{21}-ti^{11} ɓue^{42}
     Tsiang-Ta   PASS   1SG   inform   Li-Ti   dispose
     si^{21} *(i^{44})   kai^{22} tu^{44} ɗou^{44} boi^{21} hu^{11} la^{11}.
     praise   3SG   MOD   book   all   buy   go   PERF
     'Tsiang-Ta had me inform Li-Ti to buy up all the books that praise (him).'

Following the patterns suggested by Chomsky (1977) and Huang (1999), the long-distance passives in Chinese and Hainan Min undergo an A'-movement rather than an A-movement. That is, even if the patient/theme argument moves, it does not move into the subject position.

Moreover, the *ioh*-NP sequence does not behave like a PP. The distribution of the semi-lexical *ioh* is very restricted. The examples in (31) show that [*ioh* NP] cannot move together, either to the position preceding the temporal adverb *na-na* 'just now' or to the sentence-initial position. The *ioh*-NP sequence is thus not considered to form a constituent.

(31) a. Bo^{22}-ta^{44} na^{42}-na^{42} ioh^5 Lau^{42}-uang^{22} phah^5.
       Bo-Ta   just. now   PASS   Lau-Uang   hit
       'Bo-Ta was hit by Lau-Uang just now.'

b.*Bo^{22}-ta^{44} ioh^5 Lau^{42}-uang^{22} na^{42}-na^{42} phah^5.
 Bo-Ta PASS Lau-Uang just. now hit
 'Bo-Ta was hit by Lau-Uang just now.'

c.*Ioh^5 Lau^{42}-uang^{22} Bo^{22}-ta^{44} na^{42}-na^{42} phah^5.
 PASS Lau-Uang Bo-Ta just. now hit
 'Bo-Ta was hit by Lau-Uang just now.'

However, it is common for a PP to occupy the initial place of a sentence.

(32) a. *Ioh^5 nang^{22} Bo^{22}-ta^{44} phah^5.
 PASS people Bo-Ta hit
 'Bo-Ta was hit by people.'

b. Dui^{11} Bo^{22}-ti^{11} Bo^{22}-ta^{44} na^{11}-ku^{11} u^{42} nai^{42}-tiom^{44}.
 toward Bo-Ti Bo-Ta very have patience
 'Bo-Ta is very patient with Bo-Ti.'

The agent argument and the main verb seem to form a constituent (*ioh* [agent + VP]), while the *ioh*-NP does not (*[*ioh* + agent]). The following coordinated sentence is acceptable.

(33) Nih^5-kia^{21} ioh^5 Bo^{22}-ta^{44} phah^5 no^{42} e^{44}, Lau^{42}-uang^{22}
 little-child PASS Bo-Ta hit two CL Lau-Uang
 hat^5 ngou^{42} e^{44}.
 kick five CL
 'The little child was hit twice by Bo-Ta and kicked five times by Lau-Uang.'

This coordinative example confirms that [*ioh* + agent] is not a constituent since *ioh* and *Lau-uang* can be separated. On the other hand, the sequence [agent +VP] (*Lau-uang hat ngou e*) acts more like a constituent.

Lastly, the anaphor *self* can refer to the subject of the *ioh* passive. Tang (1989) points out that the antecedent of the reflexive *self* is subject-oriented. Following Tang's idea, the anaphor *da^{44}-ki^{44}* 'self' in Hainan

Min should refer to the subject of the sentence. As shown in (34), da^{44}-ki^{44} 'self' can refer to either the agent argument or the patient argument.

(34) Bo^{22}-ta^{44}$_i$ ioh^5 Lau^{42}-uang^{22}$_i$ to^{21} du^{42} da^{44}-ki^{44}$_{i/j}$ kai^{22}
     Bo-Ta PASS Lau-Uang lock at self GEN
     su^{11}.
     house
     'Bo-Ta was locked by Lau-Uang in self's house.' (Bo-ta's or Lau-Uang's)

This indicates that *Lau-uang* is interpreted as a subject. Being a subject, *Lau-uang* is not assumed to be a complement of *ioh* in the constituent [*ioh* NP]. That is, the *ioh*-NP sequence does not form a constituent as a preposition phrase. The above findings (thematic relations, island sensitivity, constituency, and anaphora) all run counter to the raising movement approach.

Notice that the 'implicit external argument' test is not applicable in the case of Hainan Min. The implicit external argument is allowed in the canonical passive in English (*be*-passive), as in (35).

(35) a. The price was decreased [PRO to help the poor].
     b. The ship was sunk [PRO to collect insurance money].

However, the *ioh*-passive does not allow agent omission; thus, the 'implicit external argument' test cannot be used for Hainan Min, as in (36).

(36) *Ke^{11}-tsi^{22} ioh^5 kiang^{11}-e^{42} [PRO lai^{22} 6ang^{44}-to^{42}
     price PASS decrease come help
     kiang^{22}-nang^{22}.]
     poor-people
     'The price was decreased to help the poor.'

This paper does not fully abandon the movement account, but it adopts Huang's (1999) and Huang et al.'s (2009) analyses to consider

the passives in Hainan Min with a mixed explanation of predication and movement, as in (37).

(37)   Bo-Ta$_i$ ioh [OP$_i$ [Lau-Uang phah t$_i$]]^{10}
        predication   movement
       'Bo-Ta was hit by Lau-Uang.'

The subject *Bo-Ta* is not moved from the object position of the verb *phah*, yet it has a control relation with its following clause through a null operator. Meanwhile, the patient argument holds a movement relationship with the null operator. The movement account explains the co-reference relation between the object of *phah* and the subject of *ioh*. This combined analysis can well account for the derivation of the *ioh*-passive in Hainan Min.

After examining the structure of the *ioh*-passive, we turn to explore the syntactic differences between the Mandarin *gei*, Taiwan Southern Min *hoo*, and Hainan Min *ioh*.

3.2 Raising *ioh*-Passives

The raising analysis of the English *get*-passive is supported by Haegeman (1985) and Fox and Grodzinsky (1998), who offer three main pieces of evidence: (i) the expletive *there* may serve as the subject of *get*,^{11} (ii) there is no thematic relation between the subject and *get*, and (iii) idiom chunks are acceptable as the subject of a *get*-passive. In this section, we argue that the raising analysis for English passives cannot be used to account for the *ioh*-passive in Hainan Min.

Firstly, Fox and Grodzinsky (1998) propose that the expletive *there* can serve as the subject of the verb *get*, as in *There got to be enough*

---

^{10} Cheng et al. (1999) also account for the *hoo*-passive in Taiwan Southern Min with a mixed analysis (predication and movement). They analyze the sentence i^1 hoo^7 gua^2 $phah^4$ $siong^1$ ah^4 'He was beaten up by me' with the operator formula: $i^1{}_x$ hoo^7 [OP$_x$ [gua^2 $phah^4$ $siong^1$ x ah^4].

^{11} For sentences with the expletive *there*, like *There got to be a lot of room in this house*, Haegeman (1985) assumes that *get* can be a verb that lacks an implicit external argument. Following this assumption, Fox and Grodzinsky (1998) speculate that *get*-passives lack an implicit external argument.

water to take a bath. However, this expletive subject test cannot be used in Chinese because the subject is not phonologically obligatory in Chinese. The expletive *there* is thus not suitable for Chinese data, which does not need to employ expletive subjects to satisfy grammaticality. Secondly, Haegeman (1985) shows that an unaccusative/causative alternation can occur in the *get*-passive, as in (38). The passive *get* is considered to function as a lexical verb and the causative *get* as an ECM verb.

(38)   a. Arthur$_i$ got [t$_i$ arrested].   Unaccusative
       b. Susan got [Arthur arrested].   Causative

Unlike English, Hainan Min does not have this unaccusative/causative alternation.

(39)   a. Tsiang^{44}-ta^{44} ioh^5 *(nang^{22})   liah^3 dioh^3.
          Tsiang-Ta   PASS   people   catch   arrive
          'Tsiang-Ta got arrested.'
       b. Tsiang^{44}-ta^{44} ioh^5 Li^{21}-ti^{11} liah^3 dioh^3.
          Tsiang-Ta   PASS   Li-Ti   catch   arrive
          'Tsiang-Ta got arrested by Li-Ti.'
          '*Tsiang-Ta got Li-Ti arrested.'

The obligatory presence of the agent may cause this alternation to be impossible in Hainan Min.

In addition, Haegeman (1985) assumes that the subject of the *get*-passive bears no thematic relation to the verb *get*. The thematicity of the subject of *get* does not match the thematicity of the subject of *ioh* in Hainan Min. The subject of the *ioh*-passive can bear a thematic relation with the *ioh*-passive verb, which can co-occur with subject-oriented adverbs, like *intentionally*. The subject-oriented adverbs occur in sentences with subjects denoting an agent or an experiencer. For example, the subject *Tsiang-ta* in (40) bears a thematic relation with the passive verb *ioh…liah* 'got caught.' This relation proves that the subject position of the *ioh*-passive is a thematic position.

174

(40) Tsiang⁴⁴-ta⁴⁴   dziak³-kang⁴⁴   ioh⁵ Li²¹-ti¹¹ liah³   ɗioh³.
Tsiang-Ta   intentionally   PASS Li-Ti   catch   arrive
'Tsiang-Ta intentionally got arrested by Li-Ti.'

The first two arguments of the raising analysis do not apply to the *ioh*-passive. The third piece of evidence in support of the raising account is the idiom chunk test. The *get*-passive in English allows the object to be moved out of an idiom chunk. For example, idioms like *keep tabs on* and *take advantage of* can form *get*-passives in English (Fox and Grodzinsky 1998).

(41)   a. Tabs always get kept on foreigners in the USA.
       b. Advantage always gets taken of John.

Unlike *get*-passives, *ioh*-passives do not accept the movement of idiom chunks from the object position to the subject of *ioh*.

(42)   a. *Tsiang⁴⁴ siau²²-tse²¹ᵢ ioh⁵   Li²¹-ti¹¹   tsiah³ tᵢ ɗau⁴⁴-phu²¹.¹²
        Tsiang lady   PASS Li-Ti   eat   bean.curd
        'Miss Tsiang got taken advantage of by Li-Ti.'
       b. *Tsiang⁴⁴ siau²²-tse²¹ kai²² ɗau⁴⁴-phu²¹ᵢ ioh⁵   Li²¹-ti¹¹
        Tsiang lady   GEN   bean.curd   PASS Li-Ti
        tsiah³   tᵢ   liau²¹.
        eat   PERF
        'Miss Tsiang got taken advantage of by Li-Ti.'

The above facts show that a raising analysis cannot account for the derivation of the *ioh*-passives. The *ioh*-passive does not allow a causative-unaccusative alternation. In addition, the subject of the *ioh*-passive bears a relation to the *ioh* verb. Idiom chunks also do not easily undergo passivization in the *ioh*-passive.

---

¹² *Tsiah³ ɗau⁴⁴-phu²¹* in Hainan Min or *chi dou-fu* in Mandarin literally indicate 'eat bean curd,' which idiomatically means 'take advantage of.'

4. PASSIVES IN HAINAN MIN, TAIWAN SOUTHERN MIN, AND MANDARIN

4.1 Causative-Unaccusative Spectrum

The analysis in the present study is conducted in the spirit of Huang's (2011, 2012, 2013) accounts of Chinese passives, under the title of 'passivization cartography,' which involves passive structures with a main predicate and a higher added verb. The following (43) is a quote from Huang[13]:

(43)   Passivization cartography: Non-canonical passives are formed by superimposing on the main predicate a higher semi-lexical verb whose meaning may include one or more points in the causative-unaccusative spectrum.

In statement (43), the semi-lexical verb is assumed to convey meanings in the 'causative-unaccusative' spectrum, which is shown in (44).

(44)   The causative-unaccusative continuum:

cause > let > witness > undergo > be affected by > become > exist > be

The semi-lexical verb often incorporates multiple meanings in/from this causative-unaccusative spectrum. For example, in this continuum, the English *get* occupies three points: 'undergo,' 'be affected by,' and 'become' (Huang 2013: 103). Huang argues that due to the multiple meanings of *get*, *get*-passives allow accounts based on control and raising. Unlike *get*, the verb *be* only expresses a single meaning. It can be speculated, then, that *be*-passives are simply raising structures. The contrast between *be*-passives and *get*-passives is explained by Huang (2011, 2012, 2013) based on the cartography approach proposed by Rizzi (1997) and Cinque (1999). Huang also applies the passivization

---

[13] A description of passivization cartography can be found in Huang (2011: 3), Huang (2012: 6), and Huang (2013: 103).

cartography to explain the diversity of Chinese passives, including the *bei*-passive '*be*-passive,' *gei*-passive '*give*-passive,' *rang*-passive '*cause*-passive,' and *jiao*-passive '*let*-passive.' These passive verbs have different 'bandwidths' along the spectrum and can, therefore, express several distinct meanings. For example, *bei* occupies a narrow part of the bandwidth and only means 'passive'; *rang* occupies a slightly wider range and means 'cause' and 'let'; while *gei* occupies a much wider bandwidth and indicates 'give,' 'let,' and 'passive.'

The multiple interpretations of *ioh* match some meanings contained within the causative-unaccusative spectrum. This paper employs this spectrum to examine the bandwidths of meanings of semi-lexical verbs in Hainan Min, Taiwan Southern Min, and Mandarin. Huang (2013) points out that the semi-lexical verb denoting 'undergo' takes an experiencer as its subject, and the one conveying 'be affected by' takes an affectee instead. Huang (2011, 2012, 2013) does not offer specific data to exemplify the verbs expressing 'cause,' 'let,' 'witness,' 'undergo,' 'be affected by,' 'become,' and 'exist.' Therefore, the present study provides our own examples for the clarification of these different meanings in the spectrum.

(45) Meanings of the elements in the causative-unaccusative continuum
  (i) The meaning of 'cause' is 'to compel by authority or force' or 'to serve as a direct cause of some event.' Based on this definition, an example of 'cause' is *I caused him to resign* or *Gua² hoo⁷ i¹ poah⁸ poah⁸ to²* 'I caused him to fall down' in Taiwan Southern Min.
  (ii) The meaning of 'let' is 'to give an opportunity to' or 'to make something happen through a specific action.' An example of 'let' in our study is *gei³ wo³ zhi¹dao⁴* 'let me know' in Mandarin.
  (iii) The meaning of 'witness' is 'to see something happen' or 'to allow something to happen without performing any specific actions,' for example, *the soldier sees his buddy shot*. Moreover, *jian* 'see' can be used as a passive verb in archaic Chinese.

(iv) The meaning of 'undergo' is 'to experience.' An example of an 'undergo' verb is *Wo³ gang¹gang¹ gei³ ren² peng⁴ le⁰ yi¹xia⁴* 'I was touched by somebody just now' in Mandarin.

(v) The meaning of 'be affected by' is 'having an effect or influence due to undergoing some event.' An example of 'be affected by' is *Zhang¹san¹ gei³ da³ dao⁴ song⁴ yi¹-yuan⁴ le⁰* 'Zhangsan got beaten to the extent that he was sent to the hospital.

(vi) The meaning of 'become' is 'to come to be.' Huang (2012: 6) offers an example of 'become' in Mandarin: *Bo¹-li² gei³ da³-po⁴ le⁰* 'The glass got broken.'[14]

(vii) The meaning of 'exist' is 'to be in a specific condition' or 'to happen.' Huang (2013) points out that *gei* in Mandarin with the meaning of existential 'happen' can express the 'exist' meaning along the causative-unaccusative spectrum. The example offered by Huang (2013) is *Fan⁴ ren² gei³ pao³ le⁰* 'It happened that the prisoner ran away.'

(viii) The meaning of 'be' is light. The semi-lexical verb is considered as a linking verb to connect the subject and the predicate. An example of the meaning 'be' is *Xiao³ gou³ gei³ bing⁴ le⁰* 'The puppy was sick' in Mandarin.

Different semi-lexical verbs may occupy different bandwidths of meanings in the above eight points. After delineating the semantic accounts for the different elements, we turn to explore the order of the points in the causative-unaccusative spectrum. Although Huang (2013) does not clearly explain the order of the continuum, the light verb BECOME is proposed by Huang (1999) to introduce the experiencer subject of the *get*-passive. That is, *get* can be decomposed into a light verb BECOME in the *get*-passive. In addition, the giving verb *give* is decomposed into two heads, CAUSE and HAVE (Harley 2002; Kiparsky 1997; Richards 2001). Harley (2002) argues that the giving verb decomposes into a predicate CAUSE and a preposition HAVE. The

---

[14] According to Huang (2012: 6), the meaning of 'undergo' has an experiencer as its subject; the meaning of 'be affected by' has an affectee subject; and the meaning of 'become' carries an unaccusative verb with no thematic subject.

giving verb can be further decomposed into [CAUSE + BECOME + WITH] or [CAUSE + BE + WITH]. Harley (2012) also states that the verb *get* is decomposed into [BECOME + HAVE]. Notice that for *give* and *get*, only CAUSE and BECOME are considered as verbs, while HAVE and WITH are considered as prepositions. Following this decomposition idea, we assume that the verb *take* can be decomposed into [CAUSE + BECOME + WITH] or [CAUSE + BE + WITH]. As for *give*, it is interpreted as [*a* CAUSE *b* HAVE *c*]. Likewise, *take* can be construed as [*a* CAUSE *b* NOT HAVE *c*] or [*a* CAUSE *a* BECOME HAVE *b*]. Based on Harley's conclusions (2002, 2012), the main verb is CAUSE rather than HAVE.

The verb *give* may retain the meaning of CAUSE and become a causative verb.

(46)   Decomposition of *get*, *give*, and *take*
       get: *a* BECOME HAVE *b*/ *a* BECOME BE WITH *b*
       give: *a* CAUSE *b* HAVE *c*/ *a* CAUSE *b* BE WITH *c*
       take: *a* CAUSE *a* BECOME HAVE *b*/ *a* CAUSE *a* BECOME BE
           WITH *b*

Feng et al. (2008) argue that *gei* 'give' develops from a common verb into a causative verb. They follow the decomposition analysis of *gei* and propose that *gei* develops into a causative verb through emphasizing the meaning of CAUSE and lightening the meaning of HAVE. Following Feng et al. (2008), this paper speculates that *take* obtains the meaning of CAUSE when CAUSE is strengthened. Likewise, the meanings of BECOME and BE may be derived in a similar way.

In addition to the decomposition analysis, Xu (1994) argues from a semantic perspective that *gei* 'give' becomes causative because *gei* involves three arguments, 'a person gives another person something.' The meaning is further extended to 'give somebody the chance to do something.' Xu also points out that this semantic extension leads *gei* to become a lexical causative verb. The verb *gei* is thus interpreted to hold a CAUSE meaning. Xu further argues that the verb *take* can have two contrary meanings: 'give' and 'take away.' For example, in sentences like *take him another book*, Xu argues that *take* is construed as 'give'

rather than 'take away.' In the account of Xu, *take* and *give* are semantically close to each other. It is the direction of the receiving that makes *take* different from *give*. Following Xu's idea of '*take=give*' in some contexts, *take* and *give* may share some semantic properties. *Take*, like *give*, may be interpreted as CAUSE. On the other hand, the verb *give* in many Chinese dialects (e.g., Guangzhou Yueyu, Meixian Kejiahua, Xiamen Minyu, Chaozhou Minyu, Fuzhou Minyu, Hengyang Xiangyu, Gaoan Ganyu, and Wenzhou Wuyu) performs two functions: as a full verb 'give' and as an agent marker (Hashimoto 1987; Yuan 2001; Zhan 1981). Since *take* can be interpreted as *give* in some contexts, it is not strange for *take* to function as an agent marker in some languages.

The causative-unaccusative spectrum goes from 'cause' at one end to 'be' at the other end (cause > let > witness > undergo > be affected by > become > exist > be). While Huang (2011, 2012, 2013) does not explain the order, the present study explores the elements in the spectrum and their order. The points in the spectrum can be re-interspersed as "causative-passive-unaccusative" by using a more coarse-grained scale. 'Cause,' 'let,' and 'witness' are assumed to be in the same category, "causative"; 'undergo' and 'be affected by' are in the "passive" category; 'become,' 'exist,' and 'be' are in the "unaccusative" one.

(47)   The 'causative-passive-unaccusative' spectrum
        a. causative: cause, let, witness
        b. passive: undergo, be affected by
        c. unaccusative: become, exist, be

In addition, according to Shibatani and Pardeshi (2001), the elements along the causative continuum can be distributed into the following categories: 'direct causative,' 'sociative causative,' and 'indirect causative.' Shibatani and Pardeshi (2001) state that the semantics of 'cause' are closer to the direct causative, 'witness' is closer to the indirect causative, and 'let' lies between these two end-points. 'Undergo' and 'be affected by' are categorized as 'passive' because these two predicates take either an experiencer or an affectee as their subjects. The difference between these two is that effects, influences, and changes

occur on the subject of 'be affected by' and not on the subject of 'undergo.' As for the 'unaccusative' category, the spectrum includes three elements: 'become,' 'exist,' and 'be.' Sorace (1993, 2000) proposes four semantic properties of the unaccusative: (i) change of location, (ii) change of state, (iii) continuation of a pre-existing state, and (iv) existence of state. 'Become' can reflect the semantics of 'change of state'; 'exist' can reflect the semantics of 'continuation of a pre-existing state' and 'existence of state.' Being semantically light, the copular verb 'be' is located at the end of the unaccusative category. It serves as a linking element to connect the subject and the predicate.

The order of the 'causative-passive-unaccusative' spectrum is determined by the number of arguments. For example, in (48), the causative has three arguments: Joe, Mary, and the door. The passive has two arguments, and the unaccusative has one. The number of arguments decreases from causative to unaccusative structures.

(48)   a. Joe caused Mary to open the door.
       b. The door was opened by Mary.
       c. The door opened.

Moreover, Huang (2013) points out that the causative-unaccusative continuum can be supported by the syntactic hierarchy of *jiao*, *rang*, *ba*, *bei*, and *gei*. That is, when *jiao* and *gei* co-occur, *gei* can follow *jiao*, but not the other way around. The syntactic hierarchy corresponds to the order of the light verbs CAUSE (*jiao*), LET (*rang*), AFFECT (*ba*), UNDERGO (*bei*), HAPPEN (*gei*), and EXIST (*gei*). In this continuum, *gei* can express HAPPEN and EXIST. The following section will discuss these causative/passive-related meanings conveyed by *ioh* in Hainan Min and other passive words in Chinese dialects.

4.2 *Take*-Passives in Hainan Min vs. *Give*-Passives in Taiwan Southern Min

This section explores the *give*-passives in Taiwan Southern Min so as to clarify the characteristics of the *take*-passives in Hainan Min. The Southern Min dialects mostly employ the giving verb to express passives.

Hoo[7] 'give' functions as a passive semi-lexical verb in Taiwan Southern Min. Although it is a member of the Southern Min dialects, Hainan Min uses a very unusual word, *ioh* 'take' to express passives. The giving verb in Hainan Min is *ɓun* 'give,' which is simply a common verb, not found in association with passive structures. Hashimoto (1988) conducted a typological survey of Chinese passive constructions and concluded that Chinese dialects chiefly use two types of passive semi-lexical verbs. The 'cause/let' type has been developed in the northern dialects; whereas the 'give/yield' type has been developed in the southern dialects. Hashimoto's theory is sufficient to describe the use of passive semi-lexical verbs in the dialects in the Min group, with the exception of Hainan Min.

While *hoo* 'give' is morphologically different from *ioh* 'take,' it shares some similarity with *ioh* in that both words allow for multiple meanings. Unlike Hainan Min passives, Taiwan Southern Min *hoo* has been introduced and broadly studied in the literature (e.g., Cheng et al. 1999; Lee 2009; Lien 2008). The previous research has reached a consensus on the meanings conveyed by *hoo*. In addition to its passive readings, *hoo* can also indicate the meanings of *give*, *cause*, *let*, *undergo*, and *be affected by*, as in (49)-(53).

(49) I[1]   hoo[7]   goa[2]   chinn[5].[15]
      3SG   give   1SG   money
      'He gave me money.'

(50) I[1]   nau[7]   goa[2],   beh[4]   hoo[7]   goa[2]   khun[3]
      3SG   annoy   1SG   want   cause   1SG   sleep
      boe[7]   khi[3].
      NEG   go
      'He was annoying me, wanting to hinder me from falling asleep.'

---

[15] The double (nn) indicates a nasalized vowel (see Douglas 1873). The tone diacritics for Taiwan Southern Min are presented in terms of tone numbers. Their corresponding pitch values are: 1-high flat, 2-high falling, 3-mid falling, 4-acute low, 5-contour, 7-low flat, and 8-acute high.

(51) A^1-bu^2 kong^2 koo^3-su^7 hoo^7 goa^2 thiaN^1.
      mother tell story let 1SG listen
      'Mother let me listen to her story.'

(52) A^1-beng^5 hoo^7 i^1 bong^1 tioh^8.
      A-Beng undergo 3SG touch arrive
      'A-Beng was touched by him.'

(53) A^1-beng^5 hoo^7 in^1 lau^7-pe^7 phah^4 kah^4 kha^1
      A-Beng affected 3SG-GEN father hit to leg
      tng^7 khi^3.
      break go
      'A-Beng was hit by his father to the extent that A-Beng's leg was broken.'

Like *ioh* in Hainan Min, the *hoo*-passive is also allowed to co-occur with subject-oriented adverbs, as in (54)-(55).

(54) A^1-hoe^1 koo^3-i^3 hoo^7 goa^2 phah^4.
      A-Hoe purposely PASS 1SG hit
      'A-Hoe was purposely hit by me.'

(55) A^1-hoe^1 bo^5 thiau^5-kang^1 beh^4 hoo^7 goa^2 me^7.
      A-Hoe NEG intentionally want PASS 1SG scold
      'A-Hoe did not intentionally want to be scolded by me.'

Furthermore, the *hoo*-passive does not allow the omission of the agent argument, as in (56). If the agent argument is *lang*^{5} 'people,' it can be phonologically merged with the verb *hoo* and said as a monosyllabic word: *hoong*^{5}. Under this circumstance, the agent argument is still phonologically explicit rather than implicit.

(56) a. A^1-hoe^1 hoo^7 lang^5 phah^4.
        A-Hoe PASS people   hit
        'A-Hoe was hit by somebody.'
     b.*A^1-hoe^1 hoo^7 phah^4.
        A-Hoe   PASS hit
        'A-Hoe was hit by somebody.'
     c. A^1-hoe^1 hoong^5 phah^4.
        A-Hoe   PASS-people   hit
        'A-Hoe was hit by somebody.'

As for the unaccusative part, *hoo^7* does not perform the whole of the functions of the unaccusatives (*become*, *exist*, *be*), as shown in data (57)-(59).

(57) BECOME:
      Li^2 e^5 cha^1-boo^2-kiann^2 hoo^7 (i^1)   phah^4-tioh^4-siong^1
      2SG   GEN   female-child   HOO 3SG   hit-hurt
      ah^4.
      PART
      'Your daughter got hurt.'

(58) EXIST:
      *In^1 bo^2 hoo^7 chau^2 ah^4.
      3-GEN   wife   HOO   run   PART
      'It happened to him that his wife ran away from him.'

(59) BE:
      *Kau^2-a^2 hoo^7 penn^7 ah^4.
       little.dog   HOO   sick   PART
       'The little dog was sick.'

(57) can be acceptable when *hoo^7* is followed by the third person singular pronoun *i*.[16] Based on Lin (2011), the *hoo^7 i^1* sequence can form a special construction in Taiwan Southern Min; it is a purely

---

[16] The author thanks the reviewer for offering suggestions, references, and related examples like *kau^2-a^2 hoo^7 (i^1) penn^7 si^2 ah^4* 'The little dog was sick to death.'

unaccusative structure that does not have a causative alternation. This unaccusative construction requires the pronoun i^1, in either an overt or a covert form. In addition, the third person singular pronoun cannot be referential. A typical example of the use of the unaccusative *hoo i* structure is offered by Lin (2011: (7b)) as in *Bak^8-cui^2 hoo^7 (i^1) ta^1-khi^3 a^0* 'The ink has gone dry.' The tone value of *hoo^7* is 21. When *i^7* occurs covertly, the tone value of *hoo^7* becomes 33 (see Huang 1999; Cheng and Cheng 2009; Lin 2011). Lien (2008) also points out that the glottal stop can be a compensatory element for the third person pronoun when *hoo^7* is followed by *i^1*, especially in allegro speech. The unaccusative construction not only syntactically requires the third person pronoun to follow *hoo^7*, but also must be semantically related to an event that denotes a change of state. This meaning of 'change of state' may be associated with the acceptability of (57). The meaning of 'become' emerges following a 'change of state.' That is, after the event of hitting, the state of the subject changes and becomes hurt, which state is decoded by the use of the resultative complement *tioh^4-siong^1* 'hurt.' When a resultative complement is added to sentences (58) and (59), the two sentences become more acceptable, as in *In^1 bo^2 hoo^7 (i^1) chau^2 khi^3 ah^4* 'His wife ran away from him' and *kau^2-a^2 hoo^7 (i^1) penn^7 si^2 ah^4* 'The little dog was sick to death'. The improvement of the grammaticality of the two sentences proves that the unaccusative *hoo i* construction denotes the meaning of 'become.' On the other hand, (58) and (59) are not acceptable without the resultative complements because the core semantics of the *hoo i* construction are that of a 'change of state,' which is mostly encoded by the resultative complement. Without resultative complements, the ungrammaticality of (58) and (59) indicate that the meanings of 'exist' and 'be' are not denoted in the *hoo* construction.[17]

In summary, the grammatical functions of the giving verb *hoo* in Taiwan Southern Min seem to be close to those of the taking verb *ioh* in Hainan Min. Verbs of the 'give' type are akin to verbs of the 'take' type in occupying a similar bandwidth along the spectrum. However, if the

---

[17] In Mandarin, it is acceptable to utter sentences with the *gei* V sequence, like *ta lao-po gei pao le* 'his wife ran away from him' and *xiao gou gei bing le* 'the little dog was sick.' The resultative complement is not required to co-occur with *gei*. The Mandarin *gei* is discussed in Section 4.3.

unaccusative *hoo i* construction is considered, the bandwidth of *hoo* may be widened to include the meaning of 'become.'

(60)   The bandwidth of Taiwan Southern Min *hoo* in the causative-unaccusative spectrum:

$$\boxed{\text{cause} > \text{let} > \text{witness} > \text{undergo} > \text{be affected by} > \text{become}} > \text{exist} > \text{be}$$

4.3 *Take*-Passives in Hainan Min vs. *Give*-Passives in Mandarin

This section discusses the similarities and differences between the passive structures of Hainan Min and Mandarin. The *ioh*-structure can not only express passive meanings, but also causative ones. The various interpretations of the *ioh*-structure are very distinct from those of the *bei*-structure. Unlike *bei*, the word *gei* can convey multiple semantics. The *gei*-passive '*give*-passive' is widely used in Mandarin. It allows the omission of the agent argument, as in (61). The *gei*-passive also allows subject-oriented adverbs, as in (62). In addition, *gei* can express a causative meaning, as in (63).

(61) $Zhang^1san^1$ gei^3 (ren^2) da^3 le^0.
        Zhangsan   PASS   people   hit   PERF
        'Zhangsan was hit by somebody.'

(62) $Zhang^1san^1$ gu^4-i^4 gei^3 wo^3 da^3.
        Zhangsan   purposely   PASS   1SG   hit
        'Zhangsan was purposely hit by me.'

(63) $Zhang^1san^1$ gei^3 wo^3 de^2 di^4-i^1 $ming^2$.
        Zhangsan   let   1SG   get   first   prize
        'Zhangsan let me get the first prize.'

The *gei*-passive is assumed to be a non-canonical passive in Mandarin (Huang 2011). However, the distribution of the *gei*-passive is very different from that of the *ioh*-passive. The *gei*-passive frequently

omits the agent. Such omission forms a pattern of [*gei*-V], which is not allowed in Hainan Min.

(64) a. Zhang^{1}san^1 gei^3 sha^1 le^0.
        Zhangsan   PASS   kill   PERF
        'Zhangsan was killed.'

    b. Xiao^3 gou^3 gei^3 zhuang^4 le^0.
        little dog PASS   bump   PERF
        'The little dog was bumped.'

This [*gei*-V] form is widely used and has developed into a specific construction in Mandarin (Shen and Sybesma 2010). The distribution of the [*gei*-V] construction is distinct from that of other constructions with semi-verbs (e.g., *ioh*, *hoo*). For example, *gei* can co-occur with other functional words, while *ioh* in Hainan Min cannot. Firstly, the disposal semi-verb *ba* in Mandarin can precede *gei*, while the disposal semi-verb *ɓue* in Hainan Min cannot be followed by *ioh*.

(65) Mandarin: *ba…gei*
    Zhang^{1}san^1 ba^3 yu^2 dou^1 gei^3 chi^1 le^0.
    Zhangsan   dispose fish all   give   eat   PERF
    'Zhangsan ate all the fish.'

(66) Hainan Min: *ɓue…ioh*
    *I^{44} ɓue^{42} ɦu^{22} dou^{44} ioh^5 tsiah^3 la^{11}.
    3SG   dispose fish all   take eat   PERF
    'He ate all the fish.'

Secondly, the passive semi-verb *jiao* can co-occur with *gei*-VP, while *ioh*-VP is not acceptable. That this phenomenon also occurs in Mandarin is noted by Tang (2001).

(67) Mandarin: *jiao…gei*
Bei^{1}zi^0 jiao^4 wo^3 gei^3 da^3 sui^4 le^0.
cup   call   1SG   give   hit   break   PERF
'The cup was broken by me.'   (Tang 2001: (108))

(68) Hainan Min: *$\hbar$am…ioh[18]
*Tsiang^{44} $\hbar$am^{11} gua^{21} ioh^5 phah^5 sui^{11} la^{11}.
cup   call   1SG   take   hit   break   PERF
'The cup was broken by me.'

    Thirdly, the passive semi-verb *rang* can co-occur with *gei*-VP, while *ioh*-VP cannot.

(69) Mandarin: *rang…gei*
Yu^2 rang^4 Zhang^{1}san^1 dou^1 gei^3 chi^1 le^0.
fish   yield   Zhangsan   all   give   eat   PERF
'The fish was all eaten by Zhangsan.'

(70) a. Hainan Min: *dziang…ioh*
*Hu^{22} dziang^{42} tiau^{21}-uang^{22} ɗou^{44} ioh^5 tsiah^3 la^{11}.
fish   yield   little-Wang   all   take   eat   PERF
'The fish was all eaten by Little Wang.'

b. Hainan Min: *ioh…ioh*
*Hu^{22} ioh^5 tiau^{21}-uang^{22} ɗou^{44} ioh^5 tsiah^3 la^{11}.
fish   let/yield   little-Wang   all   take   eat   PERF
'The fish was all eaten by Little Wang.'

    Fourthly, the word *gei* can even be reduplicated in a sentence, while *ioh* cannot be reduplicated.

---

[18] The word *jiao* in Mandarin may be interpreted as 'call' or 'teach.' In Hainan Min, *$\hbar$am^{11}* 'call/ask' is assumed to correspond to *jiao* in Mandarin. It is because *$\hbar$am^{11}* can be interpreted as 'cause' in some situations, while *ka^{11}* 'teach' is simply used as a lexical verb indicating 'teaching.'

(71) Mandarin: *gei…gei*[19]
      Zhang^{1}san^1 gei^3 che^1 gei^3 zhuang^4 le^0.
      Zhangsan   give   car   give   hit   PERF
      'Zhangsan was hit by a car.'

                                    (Shi 1997: note 2; Tang 2001: (28))

(72) Hainan Min: **ioh…ioh*
      *Tsiang^{44}-ta^{44} ioh^5 tsia^{44} ioh^5 phong^{11} tiang^{44} la^{11}.
       Tsiang-ta   take   car   take   hit   wound   PERF
       'Tsiang-Ta was hit and wounded by a car.'

The above examples show that, unlike the widely used [*gei*-V] form in Mandarin, the [*ioh*-V] pattern is not a possible sequence in Hainan Min.

In summary, *ioh* can express several meanings, occupying five points in the causative-unaccusative spectrum, as shown in (73).

(73) The bandwidth of Hainan Min *ioh* in the causative-unaccusative spectrum:

| cause > let > witness > undergo > be affected by | > become > exist > be |

Furthermore, data in (74), (76), and (78) show that *ioh* cannot be interpreted as 'become,' 'exist,' or 'be.' These data also serve to support the conclusion regarding the spectrum in (73). Compared with Hainan Min *ioh* in (74), *gei* in Mandarin can be interpreted as 'become,' as shown in (75) by Tang (2006).

---

[19] Shi (1997) and Tang (2001) argue for the acceptance of sentences with a reduplication of *gei* (*gei…gei*). In addition, Tang (2001) speculates that *gei* is an 'affectedness' marker, rather than a passive morpheme. 'Affectedness' indicates a semantic property, associated with a theme/patient argument with a change of state. Tang's (2001) assumption is mainly based on the contrast in acceptability between a **ba…bei* sequence and a *ba…gei* sequence. Our paper supports Tang's idea by considering 'being affected by' as a property of the cluster of the concepts included under 'passive.' Under our macro-passive idea, 'undergo' and 'be affected by' are generalized to 'passive.'

(74) BECOME in Hainan Min:
   *Du²¹ kai²²   ta⁴⁴-bou²¹-kia²¹   ioh⁵ ho¹¹ tiang⁴⁴ la¹¹.
   2SG GEN   female-child   IOH scald hurt   PERF
   'Your daughter got burned.'

(75) BECOME in Mandarin:
   Ta¹   gei³   da³-shang¹ le⁰.
    3SG become hit.hurt   PERF
   'He got hurt.'

Ioh cannot be interpreted as 'exist,' as in (76), while *gei* in Mandarin can be construed with an existential reading. According to Huang (2013), *gei* in Mandarin is a semi-lexical unaccusative verb with the meaning of existential 'happen.'

(76) EXIST in Hainan Min:
   *Lau⁴²-pho⁴⁴ ioh⁵   tau²¹   liau²¹.
    wife   IOH   run   PERF
   'It happened that his wife ran away.'

(77) EXIST in Mandarin:
   Fan⁴ren² gei³   pao³   le⁰.
   prisoner happen run.away   PERF
   'It happened that the prisoner ran away.'

Similarly, while *ioh* does not develop into 'be,' as in (78), *gei* in Mandarin does, as in (79).

(78) BE in Hainan Min:
   *Lau⁴²-liu²² ioh⁵   ɓe⁴⁴ la¹¹.
   Lau-Liu   IOH   sick PERF
   'Lau-Liu was sick.'

(79) BE in Mandarin:
Xiao^3 gou^3 gei^3 bing^4 le^0.
little dog be sick PERF
'The little dog was sick.'

Since *gei* is an unaccusative verb and *gei*-passives behave very differently from *bei*-passives, Huang does not consider that the *gei*-passive functions as a passive construction, but as an existential, raising construction.

Unlike *ioh* in Hainan Min, *gei* can express several meanings. The bandwidth of *gei* in Mandarin is wider than that of *ioh* in Hainan Min.

(80) The bandwidth of Mandarin *gei* in the causative-unaccusative spectrum:

cause > let > witness > undergo > be affected by > become > exist > be

The present study compares the passive semi-lexical verbs in three Chinese dialects (two giving verbs and one taking verb). Although Mandarin and Taiwan Southern Min both employ the giving verb to express 'causative' and 'passive' meanings, they do not share the same bandwidth in the spectrum. On the other hand, the taking verb *ioh* in Hainan Min shares a similar bandwidth with the giving verb *hoo* in Taiwan Southern Min, except that *hoo* denotes the meaning of 'become' in the *hoo i* construction. Notice that this construction is a special structure restricted by the syntactic and semantic requirements. It syntactically asks for the third person singular pronoun to follow *hoo* and semantically denotes the meaning of 'change of state.' *Hoo* in the *hoo i* construction expresses the meaning of 'become,' which is not denoted by the Hainan Min *ioh*. If the unaccusative *hoo i* construction is considered, the meanings of the Taiwan Southern Min *hoo* are different from those of the Hainan Min *ioh*. The following table shows the commonalities and differences among the three dialects.

191

Table 1. A comparison of *ioh*, *hoo*, and *gei*

Dialects	Verbs	Meanings from causative to unaccusative
Hainan Min *ioh*	take	cause, let, witness, undergo, be affected by
Taiwan Southern Min *hoo*	give	cause, let, witness, undergo, be affected by, become
Mandarin *gei*		cause, let, witness, undergo, be affected by, become, exist, be

The result of the comparison shows that the same semi-lexical verb in different dialects does not share the same bandwidth of meaning. Conversely, different verbs (*take* vs. *give*) may share a similar bandwidth.

In addition to the semantic differences between Southern Min and Mandarin, one can also distinguish the three dialects by their syntactic behaviors. The crucial difference between them is that the Mandarin *gei* allows the omission of the agent; *ioh* does not accept the omission; and Taiwan Southern Min only partially accepts a particular type of agent omission, as shown below.

(81) a. Zhang^{1}san^1 gei^3 (ren^2) da^3 le^0. (Mandarin)
         Zhangsan PASS people hit PERF
         'Zhangsan was hit by somebody.'
     b. Tiunn^1-sam^1 hoo^7 *(lang^5) phah^4. (Taiwan Southern Min)
         Tiunn-sam PASS people hit
         'Zhangsan was hit by somebody.'
     c. Tiunn^1-sam^1 hoong^5 phah^4. (Taiwan Southern Min)
         Tiunn-sam PASS.people hit
         'Zhangsan was hit by somebody.'
     d. Tsiang^{44}-ta^{44} ioh^5 *(nang^{22}) phah^5. (Hainan Min)
         Tsiang-ta PASS people hit
         'Zhangsan was hit by somebody.'

Gei can immediately precede a verb without the agent to form the [*gei*-V] pattern. The omission of the agent in Hainan Min is not acceptable. The examples in (81) demonstrate that the three semi-lexical

verbs in different Chinese dialects are undergoing different stages of grammaticalization. *Gei*, *hoo*, and *ioh* are used as common verbs and, at the same time, perform more grammatical types of functions as causative, passive, and even unaccusative semi-verbs. *Ioh* tends to retain more verbal properties. *Gei* has developed more grammatical properties, which enables it to attach to the following verb. *Hoo* basically does not allow agent-omission, but when the agent is the noun *lang* 'people,' *hoo* incorporates the nasal part of *lang* to become *hoong*.

Notice that the divergence in the distribution of the syntactic elements among the three dialects matches their semantic differences. According to our coarse-grained spectrum, *gei* in Mandarin carries the unaccusative ('become,' 'exist,' 'be') meanings, while *hoo* and *ioh* in the Min dialects do not. Compared with 'cause' and 'be affected by,' 'be' is semantically lighter. Both *hoo* and *ioh* can express the meanings of 'cause' and 'be affected by,' while only Mandarin has developed the semantically lightest *be*.

5. CONCLUSION

The present study focused on the passive structure in Hainan Min, especially on the passives with the semi-lexical verb *ioh*. We used Huang's (2011) 'passivization cartography' as a framework for our analysis of semi-lexical verbs. Passivization in Chinese involves two strategies: (i) the intransitivizing of the main verb and (ii) the superimposition of a semi-lexical verb on the main predicate. Semi-lexical verbs are those that can be decomposed into eight meanings: 'cause,' 'let,' 'witness,' 'undergo,' 'be affected by,' 'become,' 'exist,' and 'be.' Based on the data shown in this paper, these eight semantic components may be simplified into 'cause,' 'passive,' 'become,' 'exist,' and 'be' on the causative-unaccusative continuum.

After showing the meanings of *ioh*, this paper also explored the syntactic structure of the *ioh*-passive, which supports the mixed account of control and movement analyses, rather than simply the raising or the control analysis. In other words, *ioh*-passives are not derived from NP-movements. Unlike the *get*-passive in English, *ioh*-passives neither use

the expletive *there* to function as the subject nor use an unaccusative/ causative alternation as shown in the study of Haegeman (1985). Furthermore, idiom chunks in Hainan Min cannot be passivized into *ioh*-passives. While the raising analysis is not well supported, the control analysis is endorsed by the allowance of subject-oriented adverbs in *ioh*-passives. In addition, the [*ioh* NP] sequence does not form a constituent, which does not match the idea of [*by* agent] of the raising analysis. Lastly, the anaphor *da*^{44}-*ki*^{44} 'self' in Hainan Min can refer to the subject of the *ioh*-passive. This subject-anaphora fact shows that the subject of the *ioh*-passive originates from the subject position rather than the movement.

By way of the argument involved in the syntactic analysis of *ioh*, it is assumed that *ioh* takes a CP as its complement. Unlike Hainan Min, *gei* in Mandarin can be attached to another verb. CP is not the only complement that *gei* can take. When the *gei*-passive takes a CP as its complement, it acts as a long passive sentence; when it takes a VP as its complement, it acts as a short one. However, short passives are not yet accepted in either Hainan Min or Taiwan Southern Min. The different developmental stages of *ioh* and *hoo* in the two Southern Min dialects result in differences in syntactic distributions in the two dialects. The use of the [*ioh* V] pattern is not possible in Hainan Min because *ioh* still strongly keeps its verbal properties, while [*hoo* V] has been partially and conditionally accepted in Taiwan Southern Min.

The passive semi-lexical verb and the taking verb share the same form in Hainan Min. It is not common for Chinese dialects to have a taking verb functioning as a passive marker. Chinese dialects mostly employ giving verbs or causative verbs to function as passive verbs. The passive semi-lexical verb in Hainan Min is thus quite unique among Chinese dialects. While the literature on Hainan Min has not previously paid much attention to the passive structure, the present study has outlined the syntactic distribution of the passives by focusing on a special semi-lexical verb in this dialect. The verb *ioh* basically performs three functions: a lexical verb, a causative semi-lexical verb, and a passive semi-lexical verb. As a causative verb, *ioh* can denote 'cause,' 'let,' and 'allow.' As a passive verb, *ioh* can denote 'suffer,' 'undergo,' and 'be affected by.' The chameleonic character of the word *ioh* is very

similar to the giving verbs in Mandarin (*gei)* and Taiwan Southern Min (*hoo*) in that it exhibits multiple functions to allow for both causative and passive usages.

The *hoo* structure in Taiwan Southern Min and the *gei* structure in Mandarin are also compared with the *ioh* structure. On the one hand, regarding the lack of agent-omission and allowance of subject-oriented adverbials, the *ioh* structure behaves similarly to the *hoo* structure. On the other hand, the *gei* structure is very different from either the *ioh* or the *hoo* structures. For example, *gei* can collocate with other functional words, like *ba* 'disposal' and *bei* 'passive,' to result in a sequence like [*ba…gei*]. The corresponding sequence in Hainan Min [*ɓue…ioh*] is not possible. This fact indicates that [*gei*-V] has developed into a robust form. It can be flexibly combined with other functional words to express disposal or passive meanings. Therefore, the omission of the agent has facilitated the construction of a particular form, the *gei* structure, which does not yet exist in Hainan Min.

The idea of passivization cartography is assumed to hold for the passives in Hainan Min. In addition to the main predicate, a semi-lexical verb needs to be superimposed on the predicate to form a passive in Hainan Min. The word *ioh* 'take' functions as the semi-lexical verb to form passives. Like the English *get* and the Mandarin *gei* 'give,' the operation of the Hainan Min *ioh* gives rise to diverse interpretations, which are included in the spectrum proposed by Huang (2013). The present study offers specific meanings and examples to clarify the eight points of the causative-unaccusative spectrum. *Ioh* in Hainan Min, *hoo* in Taiwan Southern Min, and *gei* in Mandarin are tested and explored using these examples. The comparison of the three dialects shows that *ioh* does not convey unaccusative meanings, while *hoo* and *gei* do. With *hoo* indicating 'become' in the *hoo i* construction, and *gei* having a wider width of unaccusative meanings than *hoo*, it can be concluded that *gei* occupies the widest range among the three dialects and *ioh* the narrowest. Different verbal meanings (*give* vs. *take*) do not affect the width of their meanings. Different dialects have their specific semi-lexical verbs and corresponding bandwidths for their meanings. The non-canonical passives in Chinese are often formed by adding a semi-lexical verb which may have meanings in the causative-unaccusative spectrum. This

paper explored the multiple meanings of the word *ioh* in the cartographic spectrum. We also compared the different characteristics of the non-canonical passives in Hainan Min, Taiwan Southern Min, and Mandarin.

Compared with Taiwan Southern Min and Mandarin, Hainan Min is still unknown to many linguists. This paper contributes to the comprehensive description of the passive structure in Hainan Min by use of several syntactic tests. Moreover, this paper offers the semantic meanings conveyed by *ioh* based on an examination of the various meanings contained in the spectrum. The semantics of the *ioh*-passives in Hainan Min are clearly revealed in this paper. This paper helps linguists understand both the syntactic and semantic aspects of the passive structure in Hainan Min.

REFERENCES

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2005. A note on non-canonical passives: The case of the *get*-passive. In *Organizing Grammar: Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk,* eds. Hans Broekhuis, Norbert Corver, Riny Huybregts, Ursula Kleinhenz, and Jan Koster, pp.13-21. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bentley, Delia, and Thórhallur Eythórsson. 2003. Auxiliary selection and the semantics of unaccusativity. *Lingua* 114:447-471.

Chen, Hong-mai. 1996. *Haikou Fangyan Cidian [Haikou Dialect Dictionary]*. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Press.

Cheng, Lisa L.-S., James C.-T. Huang, Audrey Y.-H. Li, and Jane C.-C. Tang. 1999. *Hoo*, *hoo*, *hoo*: Syntax of the causative, dative, and passive constructions in Taiwanese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph* 14:146-203.

Cheng, Robert L., and Chun-Yuan Cheng. 2009. Sentence patterns of the causative, yielding and active in Taiwanese and Mandarin. *Journal of Taiwanese Vernacular* 1:80-107.

Chiu, Bonnie Hui-Chun. 1993. *The Inflectional Structure of Mandarin Chinese*. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles dissertation.

Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On wh-movement. In *Formal Syntax*, eds. Peter Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian, pp.71-132. New York: Academic.

Chu, Chauncey C. 1973. The passive construction: Chinese and English. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 1:437-470.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Douglas, Rev. Carstairs. 1873. *Chinese-English Dictionary of the Vernacular or Spoken Language of Amoy with the Principal Variations of the Chang-chew and Chin-chew Dialects*. London: Trubner and Co.

Feng, Shengli. 1997. *Hanyu de Yunlu Cifa yu Jufa [Prosody, Morphology, and Syntax in Chinese]*. Beijing: Peking University Press.

Feng, Shengli, Wei-tien Tsai, and C.-T. James Huang. 2008. A Synthetic Explanation by Traditional Exegesis with Formal Syntactic Theory－A Case Study on the Origin of the Meaning 'to give' in *gong* and *yu*. *Classical Chinese Research* 80:58-69.

Fox, Danny, and Yosef Grodzinsky. 1998. Children's passive: A view from the *by*-phrase. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29:311-332.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1985. The *get*-passive and Burzio's generalization. *Lingua* 66:53-77.

Harley, Heidi. 2002. Possession and the double object construction. *Yearbook of Linguistic Variation* 2:29-68.

Harley, Heidi. 2012. Lexical decomposition in modern generative grammar. In *Handbook of Compositionality*, eds. Wolfram Hinzen, Markus Werning, and Edouard Machery, pp.328-350. Oxford: OUP.

Hashimoto, Mantaro. 1961. Bilabial and alveolar implosives in a south Chinese dialect. *Onsei no Kenkyu [The Study of Sounds]* 2:255-263.

Hashimoto, Mantaro. 1969. Observations on the passive construction. *Chi-Lin* 5:59-71. [Project on Chinese Linguistics, Princeton University].

Hashimoto, Mantaro. 1987. Hanyu beidongshi de lishi, quyu fazhan [The history and areal development of the Chinese passive]. *Zhongguo Yuwen [Studies of the Chinese Language]* 1:36-49.

Hashimoto, Mantaro. 1988. The structure and typology of the Chinese passive construction. In *Passive and Voice*, ed. Masayoshi Shibatani, pp.329-354. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Huang, C.-T. James. 1999. Chinese passives in comparative perspective. *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* 29(4):423-509.

Huang, C.-T. James. 2011. The passivization cartography. Keynote speech presented at the 7th Conference of the European Association of Chinese Linguistics (EACL 7), Sept. 13-15, 2011, Venice Ca' Foscari University, Ca' Bernardo, Italy.

Huang, C.-T. James. 2013. Variations in non-canonical passives. In *Non-canonical Passives*, eds. Artemis Alexiadou, and Florian Schaefer, pp.95-114. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Huang, C.-T. James. 2014. Passives forever: Control, raising and implicit arguments. Paper presented in GLOW-in-Asia X. May 24-26, 2014, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan.

Huang, C.-T. James, Y.-H. Audrey Li, and Yafei Li. 2009. *The Syntax of Chinese*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1997. Remarks on denominal verbs. In *Argument Structure*, eds. Alex Alsina, J. Bresnan, and P. Sells, pp.473-499. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Lee, Hui-chi. 2009. KA…HOO constructions in Taiwan Southern Min. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics* 7(2):25-48.

Lee, Hui-chi. 2010. Hainan Min passives. *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* 40(4):765-787.

Lee, Hui-chi. 2011. Double object construction in Hainan Min. *Language and Linguistics* 12(3):501-527.

Li, Y.-H. Audrey. 1985. *Abstract Case in Mandarin Chinese*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California dissertation.

Li, Y.-H. Audrey. 1990. *Order and Constituency in Mandarin Chinese*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Liang, You-gang. 1986. Hainan dao Wenchang fangyan yinxi [Sound system of (the) Hainan Min Wenchang dialect]. *Fangyan [Dialects]* 2:123-132.

Lien, Chinfa. 2008. Special types of passive and causative constructions in TSM. In *Chinese Linguistics in Leipzig*, eds. Redouane Djamouri, Barbara Meisterernst, and Rint Sybesma, pp.223-237. Paris: CRLAO, EHESS.

Lin, Huei-Ling. 2011. Pure unaccusatives with *Hoo I* in Taiwan Southern Min. *Lingua* 121:2035-2047.

Liu, Xin-zhong. 2006. *Hainan Min Yu de Yuyin Yianjiu [The Study of Phonology in Hainan Min]*. Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Press.

Qian, Dian-xiang. 2002. *Hainan Tunchang Min Yu Yufa Yianjiu [On the Syntax of Hainan Tunchang Min]*. Kunming: Yunnan Press.

Richards, Norvin. 2001. An idiomatic argument for lexical decomposition. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:183-192.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*, ed. Liliane Haegeman, pp.281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Shen, Yang, and Rint Sybesma. 2010. Jufa Jiegou biaoji "*gei*" yu dongci jiegou de yansheng guangxi [The derivational relation between the syntactic marker *gei* and several verbal constructions]. *Zhongguo Yuwen [Studies of the Chinese Language]* 3:222-237.

Shi, Dingxu. 1997. Issues on Chinese passives. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 25:41-70.

Shi, Dingxu, and Hu Jianhua. 2005. The syntactic status of "bei." *Dangdai Yuyanxue [Contemporary Linguistics]* 7(3):213-224.

Shibatani, Masayoshi and Prashant Pardeshi. 2001. The causative continuum. In *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*, ed. Masayoshi Shibatani, pp.85-126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sorace, Antonella. 1993. Unaccusativity and auxiliary choice in non-native grammars of Italian and French: Asymmetries and predictable indeterminacy. *Journal of French Language Studies* 3:71–93.

Sorace, Antonella. 2000. Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76:859–890.

Tang, C.-C. Jane. 1989. Chinese reflexives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7:93-121.

Tang, Sze-wing. 2001. A complementation approach to Chinese passives and its consequences. *Linguistics* 39(2):257-295.

Tang, Sze-wing. 2006. A minimalist view on the syntax of BECOME. In *Minimalist Views on Language Design,* ed. Changguk Yim, pp.301–311. Seoul: Hankook Publishing Company and the Korean Generative Grammar Circle.

Ting, Jen. 1993. A-binding and the *bei*-construction in Mandarin Chinese. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Student Conference in Linguistics, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 20:239-254.

Ting, Jen. 1995. *A Non-Uniform Analysis of the Passive Construction in Mandarin Chinese*. Rochester, New York: University of Rochester dissertation.

Ting, Jen. 1998. Deriving the *bei*-construction in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 7:319-354.

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

Tsai, Wei-tien. D. 1995. Visibility, complement selection and the case requirement of CP. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 4:281-312.

Wang, Peter C. T. 1970. *A Transformational Approach to Chinese Ba and Bei*. Austin: University of Texas at Austin dissertation.

Hui-chi Lee

Wei, Pei-Chuan. 1994. Guhanyu beidongshi de fazhan yu yanbian jizhi [On the development and mechanism of change of the passive construction in Classical Chinese]. *Chinese Languages and Linguistics* 2:293-319.

Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:203-238.

Woon, Wee-lee. 2004. *Yi zhong Fangyan zai Liangdi Sandai jian de Bianyi [A dialect variation in the three generations and two locations]*. Fujian: Xiamen University Press.

Xu, Dan. 1994. The status of marker GEI Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 22(2):363-394.

Yang, Ding-fu, and Ying-cun Xia. 1992. Min fangyan fenqu de jiliang yanjiu [Statistic study on categorization in Min dialects]. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Min Dialects*, eds. Liang, Dong-han, Lun-lun Lin, and Yong-kai Zhu, pp.41-48. Guangzhou: Jinan University Press.

Yuan, Jiahua. 2001. *Hanyu Fangyan Gaiyao [Essentials of Chinese Dialects]*. Beijing: Yuwen Chubanshe.

Zhan, Bohui. 1981. *Xiandai Hanyu Fangyan [Contemporary Chinese Dialects]*. Wuhan: Hubei Renmin Chubanshe.

Hui-chi Lee
National Cheng Kung University
hclee6@mail.ncku.edu.tw

海南閩語之被動句

李惠琦
國立成功大學

本文探討海南閩語之被動句型。海南閩語的被動動詞是「著 *ioh*」，表達「拿取」的意思。本文討論「著」被動句型的語法及語意特色。「著」可以表達「使動」到「被動」的語意。本文提供了定義及例句來說明致使-非賓格光譜上的語意點。透過這些定義，本文測試了海南閩語的「著 *ioh*」，結果發現「著 *ioh*」表達從致使到被動的語意。此外，本文也透過語法測試來理解「著 *ioh*」被動句的語法特色。本文比較了台灣閩南語之「予 *hoo*」被動句及華語之「給 *gei*」被動句。這三個漢語方言使用不同的被動動詞表達被動，也有不同的語意廣度，能表達不同的語意。過去學界對於海南閩語的了解非常稀少，透過本文的解釋及分析，彌補了學界對於海南閩語被動句的陌生。

關鍵字：使動、非賓格、取-被動、海南閩語