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This paper aims to provide a fine-grained analysis of the BA construction in Mandarin Chinese from an applicative perspective, which can achieve the maximal degree of empirical adequacy in elucidating variants of the BA construction and fix some remaining problems raised in the previous studies. I have three goals in this paper. First, I present counterarguments against Kuo’s transitivity analysis of the BA construction (Kuo 2010) and refute the possessor raising approach (Kuo 2009). Second, following the applicative analysis (Pyllkänen 2002, Cuervo 2003, Kim 2008, Tsai 2008, 2009), I argue that the BA construction contains ApplP_{High} merged above VP, whose overt realization is GEI. Granted the presence of ApplP_{High}, the Affectedness imposed on the post-BA is therefore accounted for, which finds a rapport with Cuervo’s affective applicative in Spanish (2003) and Kim’s applicative analysis of causatives in Korean (2008). Along the line of this argumentation, we can explain why the BA can take an unergative verb because ApplP_{High} is blind to its verb selection. Third, granted the applicative analysis, the post-BA NP is introduced directly by ApplP_{High} in relation to the event denoted by VP, arguing for the absence of movement, which, in turn, refutes the possessor raising analysis. Given the proposed analysis, the possession between the post-BA NP and the inner NP in VP comes in a natural sense, on a par with Washio’s pragmatic possession (1993, 1995), instead of a structural one (Huang 1999). One immediate implication following from the proposed analysis is that the BA construction, not typical of MC anymore, is identical to other causatives in other languages in nature.
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1. Setting the Stage

The syntactic analysis of the BA construction\(^1\) in the Mandarin Chinese (henceforth the MC) has been the subject of extensive inquiry from various approaches and perspectives, as discussed in H.L.L (2009), BA can be further divided into two types, normal BA and causative BA, both of which have different syntactic behaviors. For instance, only does the former allow preposing of the BA to the sentence-initial position and have its alternative structure in SVO order. The latter fails to have these properties and does not have the verbal meaning ‘handle, deal with.’ In the present paper, I will only deal with causative BA, sharing similar views with Sybesma (1992, 1999) but differ in explaining causative BA construction. I will leave the former for another occasion.

---

\(^1\) As discussed in H.L.L (2009), BA can be further divided into two types, normal BA and causative BA, both of which have different syntactic behaviors. For instance, only does the former allow preposing of the BA to the sentence-initial position and have its alternative structure in SVO order. The latter fails to have these properties and does not have the verbal meaning ‘handle, deal with.’ In the present paper, I will only deal with causative BA, sharing similar views with Sybesma (1992, 1999) but differ in explaining causative BA construction. I will leave the former for another occasion.
with sufficient progress and convergence (Li and Thompson 1981, Huang, Li and Li 2009, Kuo 2009, Kuo 2010 among many others). Though divergent views on the analysis of the BA construction has been reached in the previous studies, three generalized observations are made as follows, as seen in (1), (2) and (3) respectively.

(1)  Zhiming  ba  Chunjiao  da-shang-le
     Zhiming  BA  Chunjiao  hit-hurt-Asp
     ‘Zhiming caused Chunjiao to be hit hurt.’

(2)  Zhiming  BA  Chunjiao  da-shang-le shou
     Zhiming  BA  Chunhiao  da-shang-le shou
     ‘Zhiming caused Chunjiao ‘s hand to be hit hurt.’

(3)  Zhiming  ba  deng  dian-liang-le
     Zhiming  BA  lamp  lit-light-Asp
     ‘Zhiming caused the lamp to be lit up.’

One observation, the most common one, is that the NP preceding BA must be a causative(r) element and what follows BA is the preposed inner object of VP. As shown in (1), Zhiming is the causer of this causing event in subject position, while Chunjiao is the causee of the hitting-hurt event and the object of the complex predicate dashan ‘hit-hurt’. This observation entails the presence of a gap in the complex predicate in a typical BA construction. Besides, a possessive relation can be found in BA construction. In (2)\(^2\), one can notice that the hand that suffers the hurting must be that of Chunjiao instead of others, amounting to saying a inclusive relation that Chunjiao is the possessor of the hand. The attentive reader can further note that one distinctive property distinguishing (1) from (2) is the absence of a possible gap in the complex predicate dashangle shou ‘hit-hurt the hand’ in (2). This property can be also found in (3) where there is no gap in the complex predicate dianliangle ‘lit-light,’ into which the NP deng ‘lamp’ cannot be reconstructed. Granted the observation made above, what remains of interest is that the sentences here can be inserted with an element GEN, as seen below.

(4)  Zhiming  ba  Chunjiao  gei  da-shang-le yi-duan

\(^2\) This is also known for the Retain Object Construction (ROC).
Zhiming BA Chunjiao GEI hit-hurt-Asp once
‘Zhiming caused Chunjiao to be hit cruelly.’

(5) Zhiming BA Chunjiao gei da-shang-le shou
Zhiming BA Chunhiao GEI da-shang-le shou
‘Zhiming caused Chunjiao ‘s hand to be hit hurt.’

(6) Zhiming ba deng gei dian-liang-le
Zhiming BA lamp GEI lit-light-Asp
‘Zhiming caused the lamp to be lit up.’

One can note that GEN can be only inserted before the VP or the complex predicate instead of other syntactic environments. In addition, the preposed NP or the NP carrynig ‘Affectedness’ must precede GEN. Examining the sentences in (4-6), we obtain three observations. First, the insertion of the marker GEI is optional; namely, its insertion does not affect the interpretation between (1-3) and (4-6). The post-BA/pre-GEI DP still retains its affective reading. Second, the DP in the pre-GEI position somehow plays the Affectee role in parallel to the event denoted by VP. Let use the test proposed by Chafe (1970) and Jackendoff (1990) in (7) to differentiate between agent/actor and patient/undergoer arguments. Applying the test in (7) to (4-5), we have the interpretation as in (8) and (9) respectively.

(7)
   a. What x did was ...
   b. What happened to x was ...

(8)
   a. What Zhiming did was he caused Chunjiao to be cruelly hit by him.
   b. What happened to Chunjiao is that she got cruelly hit hurt by Zhiming.

(9)
   a. What Zhiming did was he caused Chunjiao’ hands to be hurt.
   b. What happened to Chunjiao is her hands got hurt by Zhiming.

Following the interpretations in (8), we notice that the DP Zhiming is the Causer argument, the DP Chunjiao is the Affectee argument. Also, it is shown that in (9) the DP Zhiming is the Causer argument, the DP Chunjiao is the Affectee, and the DP shou ‘hand’ is the Theme
argument in the complex predicate. Bearing the careful scrutiny of (9b), we can notice that what directly undergoes Zhangsan’s hitting is the DP shou ‘hands’. The DP Chunjiao is simply the possessor of shou and happens to be affected. To be specific, the DP Chunjiao is affected by the hitting event in which her hand got hurt.

The above-mentioned observations taken into account, four puzzles arise. First, where does the affectedness imposed on the preposed DP arise from? Second, does the post-BA DP form a constituent with BA or GEI? Third, what is a relation of BA to GEI? To be specific, what is the nature of GEI? The fourth puzzle is how to explain BA can entail the occurrence, either overt or covert, of GEI, both of which form an causative-affective construction, as illustrated in (10) for perusal.

\[
\text{(10) } [\text{Causative Zhang} \quad \text{ba} [\text{Affective beizi gei} \quad [\text{VP da-po-le}]])
\]
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
Z. & \text{BA} & \text{cup} & \text{GEI} & \text{hit-broken-Asp} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Zhiming caused the cup to be broken.’

In this paper, I have three goals. First, assuming Tsai’s proposal (2008, 2009) \(^3\) with some modification and Pylkkänen’s applicative approach(2002), I argue that GEI is the spell-out of a high applicative \(^4\), namely the head of the high applicative projection \(^5\), whose specifier position is occupied by a DP introduced by the ApplP\text{High}. The DP in point is licensed to receive dative case by GEI and an Affectee role, which finds a rapport with Cuervo’s proposal of an affected applicative (2003) and Kim’s applicative analysis of the Korean I- morpheme in the causative (2008). This proposed analysis can accommodate variants of the BA constructions, inclusive of unergative verbs, relational pre-GEI NP, etc. Second, along the line of this argumentation, I further assume that BA is the head of Voice \(^6\) (Kratzer 1996)

\(^3\) ApplP\text{High} under discussion corresponds to ApplP\text{Middle} in Tsai’s analysis. Though there exist divergent theoretical implications from Tsai’s analysis and my proposed analysis to be clarified, I will leave them for another occasion.

\(^4\) Abbreviated as ApplP\text{High} henceforth.

\(^5\) To approach the BA construction from a more syntactic perspective, I replace VoiceP with \(\nu\)P for the sake of simplicity. Lin (2001) treated BA as a type of light verb labeled Cause. It is sure that there are differences
whose function is to introduce a Causer argument with respect to the event denoted by the VP consisting of ApplP_{high} and VP, amounting to saying that $BA$ can assign a theta role to the external argument but does not assign case to its ‘adjacent’ DP, differing starkly from the previous accounts that $BA$ is merely a case-assigner (Li 1990). Third, $BA$ under discussion is the realization of the causative semantics, similar to Sybesma’s account (1999) that all $BA$-constructions are inherently causative, and is responsible for the causative layer whereas the affective layer consists of ApplP_{high} and VP. Following the arguments above, I posit the syntactic topography of a typical $BA$ construction, as illustrated in (11).

(11)

![Syntax Diagram](image)

Two implications can be obtained from the posited syntactic structure in (11). First, $BA$ is a light verb introducing a Causer argument at its edge position. Second, the $BA$ construction, though conspicuous and idiosyncratic in MC, is virtually comprised of $vP$, ApplP_{high}, and VP, similar to other languages to be adduced in the present paper. The $BA$ construction, thus, is not special anymore as we gain deep insight into its topographical structure.

This paper is laid out as follows. In Section 2, I will review Kuo’s transitivity analysis of $BA$ (2010) and provide counterarguments against her analysis. Section 3 is devoted to investigating the status of $GEI$ and it is arguably the head of ApplP_{high} from a comparative view with two previous studies briefly reviewed (Kim 2008, Cuervo 2003). In Section 4, I will present my proposal and demonstrate its advantages over the previous studies. Section 5 concludes this paper and discusses the implications.

---

between the terms in point. Nevertheless, for the expository reason, I leave the difference aside for the time being. This simplified distinction between Voice and $vP$ does not affect the discussion we will proceed to in the present paper.
2. Transitivity and the BA Construction (Kou 2010)

In this section, I will review Kuo’s analysis of the BA construction. Adopting Bowers’ Transitivity Projection analysis (2002), Kuo argues that there is a Transitivity Projection (TrP henceforth) below vP but above VP in the BA construction, as illustrated in (12) with its corresponding tree structure in (13).

\[(12)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Zhangsan} \quad \text{ba} \quad \text{Lisi} \quad \text{da-shang-le} \\
Z. \quad \text{BA} \quad \text{L.} \quad \text{hit-hurt-Asp} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Zhangsan hurt Lisi.’

\[(13)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{NP}_1 \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{NP}_2 \\
\text{V} \\
\text{da-shang-le} \\
\end{array}
\]

As illustrated in (13), BA is treated as a dummy verb that is inserted in the v, showing the absence of verb raising. Also, it is shown that NP_2 moves out of the VP to Spec-TrP to receive accusative case. Bower’s proposal suggests that for transitive verbs, their vP also selects an extra and optional TrP. TrP specifies no theta role but specifies accusative case only whereas vP assigns the Agent role and specifies no accusative case. Along the same line, the specifier position of TrP contains the EPP feature that attracts an accusative-specified object in the VP domain.

Her proposal sounds conclusive but might be ad hoc, as challenged by four consequences. First, as discussed by Bowers, his approach is employed for transitive verbs rather than unaccusative or intransitive ones. Nevertheless, in MC, a BA construction can also select a unergative verb, as shown in (15).
In (15), the unergative xiao ‘laugh’ can be selected by BA, suggesting that her analysis is not inclusive enough in accommodating the deviant BA sentence under discussion. To solve this problem, she suggests that for intransitive verbs, they do not have TrP. Thus, there is no potential position for the BA NP that moves from the VP domain. However, to stipulate two versions of the BA dependent on the existence of TrP weakens her explanatory power of the analysis if we seek a unified account for variants of one construction.

Second, examining the order, [NP1[BA [NP2[GEI [ VP]]]]], as well as the adverbial placement, Kuo argues for GEI as the head of TrP without any further elaboration, rendering her analysis too cursory. As noted in Tang (2002), GEI imposes affectedness on the preceding NP, suggesting that GEI can be another type of functional head instead of the head of TrP as postulated here. Nevertheless, considering Bower’s analysis of English transitive sentences, as shown in (16) for instance, the verb roll undergoes the successive-cyclic movement, from the V, to the Tr and finally to the v.

The insertion GEI, as far as Kuo’s analysis is concerned, is considered a verb base-generated at the head position of TrP, slightly departing from Bower’s original proposal. For the time being, if we assume that her analysis were on the right track, the puzzle about the affectedness imposed on the post-BA DP remains not elaborated. Simply treating GEI as an affectedness marker inserted in the head of TrP needs further refinement. To investigate the nature of GEI as a functional head and to assign it an independent syntactic status seem to be a must.

Third, in Kuo’s proposal, she allows for another element to be brought into a relation with a predicate, namely the V’-object or the Outer Object. The relevant examples are provided in (17).
As shown in (17), granted her analysis, the Outer object *bilu ‘fireplace’ in (17a) and *najian shi ‘that matter’ in (17b) are base-generated at Spec-TrP as a way of satisfying the EPP feature and come with inherent case. However, it remains unclear why in this case the Outer Object is base-generated whereas in another case, (12) for example, the lower DP moves to Spec-TrP to satisfy the EPP. Besides, pursing her account that if there is no BA inserted at v we derive a typical SVO Chinese sentence (because the verb undergoes the successive-cyclic movement from V, Tr, and to v), we should predict the grammaticality of the sentences in (18), which is not borne out.

As can be seen in (18a-b), the verb *shengle ‘start fire’ and *xiele ‘write’ undergo the successive-cyclic movement to v, as discussed by Bowers (2002: 188) that ‘all [transitive] verbs move in successive-cyclic fashion first to Tr and then to vP,’ but the sentences in point are ungrammatical. Thus, her proposal awaits another better account.

---

7 One might assume that the verb in (17a, b) are the complex predicate. Given the assumption, if the whole complex undergoes successive-cyclic movement, the resulting sentence is still ungrammatical, as shown in (a,b).

(i)

a. * [vP Zhangsan shengle huo] [TrP bilu t [VP t huo]]
Z. start-Asp fire fireplace

b. * [vP Zhangsan xiele] [TrP na-jia shi t [VP t baogao]]
Z. write-Asp that-CL matter report
Kuo investigates the BA construction from a new and insightful perspective but is confronted with the consequences noted above, which weaken the explanatory power of the analysis. What reminds us of her analysis is that she notices the possible occurrence of GEI in the BA construction that seems to impose an affective reading on the post-BA DP. In Section 3, inspired by her attention to the occurrence of GEI, I will provide a brief overview of the analysis of GEI in the previous study (Tang 2002) and argue for it to the head of ApplP_{High} that is selected by BA.

3.1 The Status of GEI

In this section, I will investigate the status of GEI and argue that GEI is not the head of TranP as proposed by Kuo (2010) in the BA construction but the head of ApplP_{High}, according to its semantics from a comparative view.

To a first approximation, the pre-GEI DP is affected by an action/event, resembling the pre-BEI DP. This resemblance casts doubt on the status of GEI similar to BEI. Let us consider (19).

(19)

a. Zhangsan bei da-sheng-le
   Z. BEI hit-hurt-Asp
   ‘Zhangsan got hurt.’

b. *Zhangsan gei da-shang-le
   Z. GEI hit-hurt-Asp
   ‘Zhangsan got hurt.’

As shown in (19), GEI cannot alternate with BEI. As evidenced by this simple test, Tang (2002) suggests that it is not correct to subsume BEI under BA or vice versa. He argues that GEI is an affectedness marker in a semantic sense, whose function is to reinforce the affected argument that seems to undergo ‘movement’ to the pre-GEI position from the lower position in a syntactic sense. He furthers argues that GEI in both the BEI and BA construction plays the same role. However, the analysis of GEI cannot be subsumed under the part of the short passive. Three distinctions are attested as follows. First, only in the certain syntactic context does the pre-GEI DP receive an affective reading, as seen in (20).

\[ *_{[\text{VP}]_i} \text{Zhangsan xiele baogao}_{[\text{TP}]_{_i} \text{na-jia} \text{shi} \text{t}_{(\text{VP} t_{(\text{VP} t_{(\text{VP}})}}] \text{Z. write-Asp report that-CL matter} \]
Second, in MC passives, we only find certain phrases patterning with GEI such as *jiao...gei ‘scream for sb’ and ran...gei ‘yield something to’, instead of jiao...bei or ran...bei. Third, GEI can only be used in certain syntactic contexts, as in (21).

(21)

a. beizi didi gei dapole
   cup brother GEI hit-broken-Asp
   ‘The cup was hit broken by the brother.’

b.*beizi didi bei dapole
   cup brother BEI hit-broken-Asp

In addition to the distinctions, Tang points out that GEI can be analyzed in parallel to BA. The differences between them is that the post-BA DP cannot be omitted whereas the post-GEI can because of phonological incorporation of the post-GEI resumptive pronoun into GEI.

4.2 Positioning GEI in the BA Construction

---

This observation comes from the fact that, in Chinese passives, the affectee argument undergoes movement to another higher position and leaves a trace, which can be overtly realized as a pronoun. However, in modern Chinese, the pronoun has been incorporated into GEI. Tang (2003) does not provide any direct empirical evidence in support of his argument. Aside from this explanation, the types of movement is not specified. Thus, the argument remains cursory. Besides, it seems that he does not take into account a sentence in (i):

(i).

?? Zhagnsan ba Lisi gei ta kule haochitian
   Zhangsan BA Lisi GEI he cry-Asp for several days
   ‘Zhangsan cried for Lisi for several days.’

If his account were on the right track and the movement belongs to A ‘-movement, it is predicted that ta ‘he’ can be co-indexed with Lisi as argued that Lisi is the derived DP via movement. I leave it for further research.
To define the status of \textit{GEI}, we need to rely on the semantics of the pre-GEI DP. First, let us consider four variants of the \textit{BA} construction in (22).

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Zhiming ba na-zhi gou gei ti-si-le
   \begin{align*}
   Z. & \quad \text{BA that-CL dog GEI hit-die-Asp} \\
   & \quad \text{‘Zhiming caused that to be hit dead.’}
   \end{align*}
\item b. Zhiming ba Lisi gei da-duan-le shou
   \begin{align*}
   Z. & \quad \text{BA L. GEI hit-broken-Asp hand(s)} \\
   & \quad \text{‘Zhiming caused Lisi’s hand(s) to be hit broken.’}
   \end{align*}
\item c. Zhiming ba na-jian shi gei xie-le yi-fen baogao
   \begin{align*}
   Z. & \quad \text{BA that-CL matter GEI write-Asp one-CL report} \\
   & \quad \text{‘Zhiming wrote a report about that matter.’}
   \end{align*}
\item d. Zhiming ba bilu gei sheng-le huo
   \begin{align*}
   Z. & \quad \text{BA fireplace GEI start-Asp fire} \\
   & \quad \text{‘Zhiming started the fire in the fireplace.’}
   \end{align*}
\end{enumerate}

As can be seen in (22a), the DP \textit{nazhi gou} ‘that dog’ is the Affective argument that is affected by the hitting-dead event caused by \textit{Zhangsan}. Note that in (22b), it is apparent that \textit{Lisi} is affected by the hitting-broken event and his hand is broken. Granted this reading, \textit{Lisi} is the Affectee whereas \textit{shou} is the Theme, the inner object of the complex predicate \textit{daduanle}. Let us consider another equivalent of (22b) in (23).

\begin{enumerate}
\item Zhangsan ba Lisi de shou gei da-duan-le
   \begin{align*}
   Z. & \quad \text{BA L. DE hand GEI hit-broken-Asp} \\
   & \quad \text{‘Zhangsan caused Lisi’s hand(s) to be hit broken.’}
   \end{align*}
\end{enumerate}

In (23), \textit{Lisi de shou} ‘Lisi’ hand’, as a complex DP, is affected by the hitting-broken event. This observation parallels to (22a). Considering (22c) and (22d), we can find that the account of (22a) and (22b) is applicable here.

However, the observation we made here might be problematic. As noted in Section 3.1 that the pre-\textit{GEI} DP seems to move out of VP, as seen in (22a, b), and there seems to be a
gap in the VP, we can find (22c, d) form another group in which there is no gap in the VP. We need to handle this gapping different between (22a, b) and (22c, d). To fix this problem and provide a satisfactory account, let us refer to indirect passives in MC where the insertion of GEI is also possible.

In an indirect passive, as shown in (24), one can note that the subject Zhangsan is the possessor of the internal argument baba of the verb dasi ‘kill.’

(24) Zhangsan bei tufei dasi-le baba
    Zhangsan BEI bandits kill-ASP father
    ‘Zhangsan had his father killed by the bandits’

To provide a syntactic account of (24), Huang (1994) proposed the complex predicate analysis in which subjects in inclusive passives are co-indexed with outer objects, the ‘Affectee argument’ of predicates, as illustrated in (25).

(25)

```
VP
    outermost objects
    [indirect Affectee]

subjects

V'
    outer objects
    [Affectee]

V'
    V
    inner objects
```

Within his framework, inclusive passives utilize a strategy over outer objects of the lower V’, which consists of a complex predicate and the inner object. Granted (25), a long passive in MC (24) has its phrase structure in (26).
In (26), the verb *dasi* ‘kill’ and the inner object ‘Pro father’ forms a complex predicate, which takes the null operator (NOP) as its outer object. The outer object NOP undergoes the null operator movement and enters into predicate relation with the matrix subject. The outer object NOP controls the null possessor Pro in the inner object NP, yielding the inclusive interpretation. Along the line of this argument, the NOP also gets the Affectee role from the complex predicate. The Affectedness interpretation comes a structural meaning, formed via passivization of outer objects.

Interestingly, one can note that a inclusive passive (24) can be inserted with *GEI*, as in (27).

(27)  
Zhangsan bei tufei gei dasi-le baba  
Zhangsan BEI bandits GEI kill-ASP father  
‘Zhangsan had his father killed by the bandits’

It is discovered that both the BA construction and the indirect passive tolerates the presence of *GEI*, and also the pre-*GEI* DP receives the affective interpretation. Huang’s analysis seems promising in covering the analysis in point. Nevertheless, a upcoming problem is how to account for the status of *GEI* in the BA construction as well as the *BEI* construction; that is, *GEI* deserves a unique status in the VP domain. Also, to postulate an extra position located at the left edge of VP, called the indirect object, seems cursory, for it does not explain the emergence of the affective interpretation imposed on the pre-*GEI* DP.

The immediate task we assume here is to find a better account for the problems noted here. Referring to Pylkkänen’s analysis, we can find the *vP* domain is more complicated than one conceives. There are a high applicative above VP and a low applicative below VP. As argued by Pylkkänen (2002), in high applicatives, it is assumed that additional objects have
the affectedness relation with the event denoted by the VP. In contrast, in low applicatives, additional objects are not directly related to the verb but form transfer of possession or source relation with the direct object. In Huang’s analysis, the affective indirect NP is introduced by the complex predicate, similar to Pylkkänen’s analysis that the extra object at the left edge of ApplP_{High} having the affectedness relation with the event denoted by the VP is introduced by the VP. We identify one symmetry between these two analyses; that is, V’ higher hosting a indirect NP corresponds to Appl’ that introduces an extra affectiveness-bearing NP. To be specific, V’ postulated by Huang is ApplP_{High} argued by Pylkkänen, as shown in (28) for comparison.

(28)
a. Huang’s analysis of Indirect Passive (1994)

```
VP
  /\ subjects
 /   V’
 /    /\ outer objects
/      /\ V’
/        /\ [Affectee]
/          /\ V inner objects

```
b. Pylkkänen’s analysis (2002)

```
vP
  /\ subjects
 /   ApplP_{High}
 /    /\ DP
/      /\ Appl’
/        /\ [Affectee]
/          /\ Appl
/            /\ VP
/              /\ V inner object
```

In the next section, based on the discussion we reached here, I will argue for my analysis that can fix the problems we are confronted with insofar and provides a better account instead.
3.3 \textit{GEI as the ApplP	extsubscript{High}}

As shown in the previous section, \textit{GEI}, either as an affectedness marker or other categories, indeed imposes a certain degree of affectedness on the pre-\textit{GEI} DP. In this section, I will demonstrate how \textit{GEI} can fit into the head of ApplP	extsubscript{High}. The direct evidence comes from the semantics of the pre-\textit{GEI} and the assumptions about applicative constructions proposed by Pylkkänen (2002).

As in Pylkkänen (2002), the syntax and semantics of applicatives can be divided into two distinct types, namely a high applicative in (29a) and a low applicative in (29b)\footnote{A high applicative will be abbreviated as HAppl whereas a low applicative as LAppl henceforth.}, depending upon whether the applicative head relates the DP in Spec position to an event VP in (29a) or to an individual/object in (29b).

(29) a. High Applicative
\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (ApplP) at (0,0) {ApplP	extsubscript{High}};
  \node (Appl) at (0,-2) {Appl};
  \node (VP) at (0,-4) {VP};
  \node (V) at (0,-6) {V};
  \node (DP) at (0,-8) {DP};
  \node (Appl') at (0,-10) {Appl'};

  \draw[->] (ApplP) -- (Appl);
  \draw[->] (Appl) -- (VP);
  \draw[->] (VP) -- (V);
  \draw[->] (V) -- (DP);
  \draw[->] (Appl') -- (ApplP);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

(29) b. Low Applicative
\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (VP) at (0,0) {VP};
  \node (ApplP) at (0,-2) {ApplP	extsubscript{Low}};
  \node (DP) at (0,-4) {DP};
  \node (Appl) at (0,-6) {Appl};
  \node (Appl') at (0,-8) {Appl'};

  \draw[->] (VP) -- (ApplP);
  \draw[->] (ApplP) -- (DP);
  \draw[->] (Appl) -- (VP);
  \draw[->] (Appl') -- (Appl);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

There are three differences worth being stressed. First, it is shown that the applied DP always asymmetrically c-commands a direct DP. To be specific, the applied DP takes a wide scope over the direct DP. Second, an ApplP	extsubscript{High} licenses the applied DP in its Spec external to the VP. In sharp contrast, a ApplP	extsubscript{Low} is internal to the VP. Third, the ApplP	extsubscript{Low} is generated as a complex object that demands the presence of an underlying direct object, whereas ApplP	extsubscript{High} does not any select any particular element but requires a vP. Hence, ApplP	extsubscript{High} can select a unergative verb as its complement. Aware of these distinctions and the relative position where \textit{GEI} occurs, I argue that \textit{GEI} is the head of a ApplP	extsubscript{High}.

Under these assumptions, I will first present a comparative view of how a ApplP	extsubscript{High} is utilized to account for causatives in Korean, which similar to the causative \textit{BA}. Assuming Distributed Morphology (Halle & Marantz 1993, 1994), Kim (2008) argued for the applicative analysis of the –\textit{I} morpheme in Korean which surfaces variously in two syntactic
contexts, causatives in (30a) and passives in (30b). As shown in (30a)\(^{10}\) and (30b), the shared property is that the applied DP is marked the dative as an applied argument.

(30)

a. Causative in Korean

Emma-Ka ai-eykey chayk-lul ilk-hi-ess-ta
emma-NOM child-DAT book-ACC read-I-PAST-DEC

‘Mother made the child read the book’

b. Passive in Korean

Minsu-ka kay-eykey tali-lul mul-li-ess-ta
Minus-NOM dog-DAT leg-ACC bite-I-PAST-DEC

‘Minus got his legs bitten by the dog.’

The support for the assimilation of two constructions into the one type comes from case marking and complement structure. In (30), the subject is nominative case-marked, the object accusative marked, and the extra argument dative-marked. The direct evidence for their taking a high applicative is that the dative argument asymmetrically c-commands the accusative argument. These show that the embedded clauses of causatives and passives in Korean satisfy the morpho-syntactic properties of applicatives but semantically belong to the ApplP\textsubscript{High}.

Crucial to Kim’s analysis is that the embedded clauses in both causatives and passives

\(^{10}\) In Korean, there are two types of causatives with respect to adverb modification, as shown in (i) and (ii) respectively.

(i). non put on type causative

\begin{verbatim}
emma-ka ai-eykeychayk-lul ilk-hi-ess-ta
mother-NOM child-DAT book-ACC read-I-PAST-DEC
\end{verbatim}

‘Mother made the child read the book.’

(ii) put on type causative

\begin{verbatim}
Emma-ka ai-eykey os-ul ip-hi-ess-ta
mother-NOM child-DAT clothes-ACC wear-I-PAST-DEC
\end{verbatim}

‘Mother dressed the child.’

In (i), the applicative can be modified by such adverbs as ‘quickly’ whereas in (ii) aieykey cannot. What is of concern is that the type of causative in (ii), as proposed by Kim (2008), have the bundling of affected and instrumental semantics into one head (i.e. Appl\textsubscript{affected/INSTR}). I adopt the type of causatives in (ii) as in a similar parallel to the \textit{BA} construction in Chinese.
involve a relation between an individual and an event, as existing in an $\text{ApplP}_{\text{High}}$. The proposed analysis is provided in (31).

(31)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{VoiceP} & \\
\text{HApplP} & \quad \text{Voice} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{DAT}} & \\
\text{VP} & \quad \text{HApplP} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{ACC}} & \quad \text{Root}
\end{align*}
\]

Causatives and passives in Korean share the same syntactic structure, namely the presence of a high applicative complement structure.

Four implications can be drawn from Kim’s analysis, which serves the basis of the analysis of $BA$ and $GEI$. First, it is noted that the subject of a passive or a causative depends on the semantics of the morpheme $–I$. If the $–I$ morpheme is a causative type, it introduces a Causer argument. In contrast, if it is a passive type, the Affectee argument is introduced therefore. Second, as noted in the put on causative, the applied object, namely the DP at Spec-$\text{HApplP}$, entails affectedness. In other words, the dative-marked DP (also called the affected instrument following Kim’s term) is affected by the event denoted by the VP, as shown in (32). Further, as pointed by Kim, in this type of causative, the applied object/dative-marked DP is not limited to animates only but can be either animate or inanimate.

(32)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Suni-ka} & \quad \text{Minsu-eksey} & \quad \text{os-u} & \quad \text{lip-hi-ess-ta} \\
\text{Suni-NOM} & \quad \text{Minsu-DAT} & \quad \text{closethes-ACC} & \quad \text{wear-II-PAST-DEC}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Suni dressed Minsu’

---

11 As argued by Kim (2008), the embedded phrases in causatives and passives can be categorized as high instrumental applicatives. In this present study, I will categorize different types of the HAppl, such as instrumental, dative, etc., into one type in a broad sense due to the impoverished morphology of Chinese.

12 To unify the passive ($BEI$) and the causative ($BA$) in Chinese seems to an optimal state of analysis. Such the unified analysis, to the best of my knowledge, is only proposed by Kuo’s applicative analysis of $BA/BEI$ (2009) and Kuo’s transitivity analysis of $BA/BEI$ (2010). Since the unified analysis is of great complexity, I will only deal with the causative, namely the $BA$ construction, in the current paper and leave the passive for further research.
Third, as shown in (32), the dative-marked DP, namely the applied object, can serve the Affectee argument. The fact the dative case is associated with the Affectee role has been extensively investigated. Cuervo (2003), for example, argues that there is another type of applied argument in addition to a typical ApplP_{High} or ApplP_{Low}: an affected applied argument\textsuperscript{13}. In Spanish, Cuervo argues that there is an affected applicative whose semantics denote a relation between an affected individual and a stative event\textsuperscript{14}, as shown in (33).

(33) Pablo le rompio la radio a Valeria
    Pablo CL.DAT broke the radio Valeria.DAT
    ‘Pablo broke the radio on Valeria’

In (33), the dative-marked DP Valeria is the applied object that is affected by the breaking-the-radio event that is caused by Pablo. The relevant phrase structure of (33) is provided in (34). Crucial to the current implication is that the dative case is associated with the Affectee role. As for how the dative is related to the theta role, say the experiencer as well as the Affectee role, the interested reader is referred to Landau (2009) for perusal.

Fourth, as noted in Pylkkänen (2002), that the dative DP/the applied DP asymmetrically c-commands the direct object (the Theme object) is captured in (34).

\textsuperscript{13} Although it is proposed in Cuervo (2003) that an affected applicative is different from a high applicative with respect to its complement, which selects \textit{vP}_{BE}, Kim assume that an affected applicative is a subtype of a high applicative in a broad sense that it denotes a relation between an individual and an event.

\textsuperscript{14} Cuervo (2003) claims that applicative heads demonstrate sensitivity to the type of event expressed by the \textit{vP} (e.g., dynamic or stative, activity or causative) because the range of possible meanings of the dative DP can be predicted from the range of possible complements an applicative head can take (i.e. a DP or a \textit{vP}). Due to the limitation of this study, I leave aside these details in relevant to the issues of concern here,
Granted these implications, I argue that when GEI is the head of ApplP<sub>High</sub>, these implications are predicted to hold.

4. The Proposed Analysis

It has been acknowledged that the BA construction can be categorized into two types, depending on the possible movement of the pre-GEI DP from the VP domain. In this section, considering the two types and a comparative perspective of causatives in Korean, I argue for the high applicative analysis of the BA construction.

4.1 Assumptions

In this paper, I assume Kratzer’s proposal (1996) that the external argument is externalized outside of the domain of predication and introduced by Voice. Voice relates the external argument to the event described by the verb, and combines it with the VP via Event Identification. Following this semantic rule, Voice introduces the argument as a participants into an event denoted by the VP. Also, assuming Kim’s (2008) account that Korean is the head of Voice comprised of CAUSE and the external thematic relation, I argue for MC to be in this loop. Under these assumptions, two consequences are predicted. First, Voice in causatives ¹⁵ is comprised of the causing relation with the caused event (the affective construction) described by the VP and the external argument is a Causer. BA ¹⁶ is the head of VoiceP, which has its semantic meaning and is able to assign a theta role to the causative argument (Causer) that it introduce but does not bear the case-assigning ability, differing from the accounts of BA in Huang, L. and L. (2009) ¹⁷. Second, though MC is a language with

¹⁵ I assume that causatives are bi-eventive structure as proposed by Pylkkänen (2002).

¹⁶ The precise category of BA has been has been the subject of several controversies. Li (1924) treated BA as a preposition, whereas Wang (1943) considered it to be a modal verb. Thought treating it as a preposition, Lee (1990) argued that it is used to case-assign NP. A eclectic views suggests that BA is a pretansitive verb (Chou 1947). A more recent perspective, as visoned by Huang (1982), argues that BA be a light verb. Assuming the minimalisit syntax, Zhang (2006) argues that BA is a functional element, devoid of any semantic content, but bears the EPP feature above CP layer. Regardless of the divergent views reviewed here, I agree with Huang’s argument that BA is a light verb that introduces a Causer argument. However, what differs from his original account is that I suggests what renders BA construction so idiosyncratic in MC is not the presence of BA but the existence of a High Applicative merged above VP, a widely-held in many languages. We will proceed to the argument in the following sections.

¹⁷ In Huang, Li and Li (2009) propose that BA does not assign a theta role to the external argument. It is the verb that assigns the theta role to the subject argument. Nerveless, let us consider another view. Marantz (1984) points out that the subject is an argument of the verb consisting of the verb and the object. In other words, the verb hit in (i) assigns the theta-role to the object and the VP assigns the ‘hitter of the ball’ to the subject. The
impoverished morphology, I assume that the applied DP, namely the argument at Spec-ApplP_{High}, is dative-marked covertly, corresponding to a comparative view that the dative-marked DP is related to the Affectee role. Aside from the consequences noted here, considering the status of GEI, I argue for it to be the head of ApplP_{High} that hosts a specifier position with the affectedness feature and assign dative case to the applied argument. The proposed phrase structure is presented as in (35).

(35)

\[
\begin{align*}
& vP \\
& \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \quad \text{[Causer]} \\
& \quad \quad BA \quad \text{ApplP}_{High} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{[Affectee]} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad GEI \quad \text{VP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The proposed analysis can provide better accounts for some issues noted in the previous studies. First, it is commonly agreed that BA is a case-assigner and can assign case to its complement, that the post-BA DP. The evidence, as noted in Huang, Li and Li (2009), for this case-assigning phenomenon comes from the observation that BA must be followed by a DP without any intervention (the Adjacency Condition, c.f. Li 1985). Aside from this and the grammaticalization of BA, any robust evidence in support of the subcategorization requirement of BA is missing. Granted the proposed analysis under discussion, BA is not simply a dummy inserted at v but has its s-selectional requirement, subcategorizing for a Causer argument in a causing event. Second, the current proposed analysis is able to explain the fact that BA can also select unergative verbs in (15), repeated in (36).

(i). John hit the ball.
(36) Zhangsan ba Lisi gei xiao-le zhengzheng sanxiao-shi Z. BA L. GEI laugh-Asp completely three-hour
‘Zhangsan laughed at Lisi for three hours.’

As noted previously, semantically, the applicative head adds a participant to the event by the rule of Event Identification, as Voice head does. Under this view, a high applicative denotes a relation between an individual and an event. Thus, in principle, this relation can be maintained without the object DP, as further supported by the possibility of high applicatives appearing with unergatives (Pylkkänen 2002). Thus, we can predict the grammaticality of (36) since a high applicative can select a unergative. Third, the major difference between the BA construction and a SVO sentence in MC lies in the existence of ApplP_{High}. As evidenced, we notice that BA entails the optional presence of GEI, suggesting that the specialty of BA is that it selects for ApplP_{High}. Such the analysis receives substantial crosslinguisic support, such as Korean and Spanish, and provides a account of the BA construction.

4.2 Deriving a BA Construction of Five Types

Granted the proposed analysis, five types of the BA construction in (22) have its structures in (37) respectively.\(^\text{18}\)

(37)

a. Zhiming [\text{\text{VP ba [ApplP_{High} na-zhi gou gei [\text{VP ti-si-le}]]}}]
Z. BA that-CL dog GEI hit-die-Asp
‘Zhiming caused that to be hit dead.’

b. Zhiming [\text{\text{VP ba [ApplP_{High} Lisi gei [\text{VP da-duan-le shou}]]}}]
Z. BA L. GEI hit-broken-Asp hand(s)
‘Zhiming caused Lisi’s hand(s) to be hit broken.’

c. Zhiming [\text{\text{VP ba [ApplP_{High} na-jian shi gei [\text{VP xie-le yi-fen baogao}]]}}]
Z. BA that-CL matter GEI write-Asp one-CL report
‘Zhiming wrote a report about that matter.’

\(^{18}\) For the sake of simplicity, some derivational details, such as trace or copies, are not noted here.
d. Zhiming \([v_p \text{ ba } [\text{AppP}_{\text{High}} \text{ bilu } \text{ gei } [v_p \text{ sheng-le huo}]])\]

Z. BA firewall GEI start-Asp fire

‘Zhiming started the fire in the fireplace.’

e. Zhiming ba Chunjiao gei xiao-le san-tian-san-ye

Z. BA C. GEI laugh-Asp three-day-three-night

‘Zhiming caused to Chunjiao to be laughed at for three days.’

As shown in (37), one can tell that the DP at the left edge of \(\text{AppP}_{\text{High}}\), whose head is \(\text{GEI}\), is merged at the VP. For example, in (37a), the hitting-dead event denoted by the complex predicate \(\text{tisile}\) needs to select an Affected argument, which is introduced by \(\text{AppP}_{\text{High}}\), which, in turn, is selected by \(BA\) at \(v\). This analysis can be extended to (37b, c, d) in the same fashion. (37e) is a BA construction that selects an unergative verb \(\text{xiao}\). Insofar, we have not tackled one problem that is widely discussed in the previous studies; that is, there is a possession relation between the DP at Spec-\(\text{AppP}_{\text{High}}\) and the inner object of VP, as shown in (37b) where it is known that Chunjiao must be the possessor of the \(\text{shou} ‘\text{hand(s).’}\) Following Huang (1994), this possession relation is termed as an inclusive relation, which exists in MC as well as Taiwanese. Huang posits that there is \(\text{pro}\) in the complex predicate co-indexed with the indirect DP (following the proposal we made, the applied DP). His analysis is tenable in accounting for the BA construction in (37b) but fail to account for other variants in (37c), (37d) and (37e) where the possession relation does not exist.

As pointed by Washio (1995), the source of the adversity interpretation is different; adversative meaning derived structurally in exclusive passives whereas in inclusive indirect passives the adversative meaning is pragmatically induced, depending partly on the lexical choice of the verb. It is shown that in indirect passives there exists a possessive relation between the subject and the internal argument of the verb, whereas in in exclusive indirect passive such the relationship does not exist. For Washio (1993), the possession in indirect passive can be attributed to some pragmatic relation (involving affectedness) between the subject and the objects of the passive object. Differing from Huang’s structural sense of possession, Washio takes sides with the pragmatic sense of possession. In the present paper, I argue for Washio’s perspective to be on the right track. In the previous studies that deal with the retained object construction of the BA construction, one can argue that there is a possessor forming a constituent with a NP, \(\text{juzi pi ‘orange skin’}\) in (38), in which the possessor \(\text{juzi ‘orange’}\) moves out, similar to \(\text{pro}\) Huang adopted in handling inclusive indirect passives.
Zhiming [v, ba [ju zi, gei [v, bo-le t, pi]]]
Z. BA orange GEI peel-Asp skin
‘Zhiming caused the orange’s skin to be peeled.’

This possessor-raising approach, however, is not theoretically desired, because it violates the Left Branching Condition (Ross 1967), shown in (39). The corresponding examples are provided in (40).

(39) **The Left Branching Condition (LBC)**
No NP which is the leftmost constituent of a larger NP can be recorded out of this NP by a transformational rule.

(40) *Zhangsan, weo renshi [t, baba]
Zhangsan I know father
‘Zhangsan, I know his father’
As shown in (40), the so-called possessor *Zhangsan* raises out of the NP and moves to a high position, violating the LBC and eliciting the ungrammaticality of (40).

Along the same line, Kuo (2009) adopted the similar possessor raising analysis of the BA construction by incorporating ApplP_{High}. A typical BA construction under her analysis is shown in (41).

---

19 The interested reader might find himself/herself that there are indeed some sentences in MC violating the LBC but holding their grammaticality, as shown in (i).

(i) Zangsani xianran [ti shoubi] hen. chang
Zhangsan obviously arm very long
‘Zhangsan’s arms are very long.’

Hsu (2009) claims that the LBC (Ross 1967) should not be treated as a condition but an illustration of the facts. Also, s/he further claims that the seeming subject-object asymmetry, as illustrated between in i(i) and (40), has to do with the information structure. We refer the interested reader to his/her for more relevant information.
As shown in (41), after the NP *Nick* gets the Possessor role from the NP *wife*, it moves to the ledge edge of recursive vP to its case. The NP *Nick* only gets the possessor role from the NP *wife*, not needing to receives the Affectee role. Thus, no affective reading is imposed on the NP *Nick* but on the NP *wife*. There are two problems posed for (41) excerpt the possible possessor raising. First, as noted in Cuervo (2003), the applicative head can case-assign the NP at its Spec position. Having a comparative view, we can notice that possessor-dative can be found in other languages, as seen in (42).

(42) Hebrew

`Ha-yalda kilkela le-Dan et ha-radio`

The girl spoiled to Dan Acc the radio

‘The girl broke Dan’s radio’

Given this account, in (41), the NP *Nick* does not have to move to the Spec-vP to receive Case anymore. Also, examining the phrase structure of (41), the NP *Nick wife* is not directly introduced but moves from the VP, differing from Pylkkänen’s original proposal that the high applicative head relates the DP in Spec position to an event VP by directly introducing the DP. Namely, the movement of the DP to Spec-AppnP\text{High} needs refinement and seek crosslinguistic evidence.
4.3 Section Conclusion

My proposed analysis can solve the problems noted in Section 2 and Section 4.2. Thus, the syntactic structure of the four types of the BA consecution are illustrated in (43).

(43)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Caused Event} \\
\text{vP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{v'}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ApplP}_{\text{High}} \\
\text{NP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Appl'} \\
\text{VP (Complex Predicate)}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Appl} \\
\end{array}
\]

a. Zhiming Z. \( BA \) Chunjiao C. \( GEI \) da-sheng-le shou hit-hurt-Asp hand
b. Zhiming Z. \( BA \) Chunjiao’s de shou C. de hand \( GEI \) da-sheng-le hit-hurt-Asp
c. Zhiming Z. \( BA \) na-jian shi that-CL matter \( GEI \) xie-le yi-fen baogao write-Asp one-CL report
d. Zhiming Z. \( BA \) bilu fire place \( GEI \) sheng-le huo light-up fire
e. Zhiming Z. \( BA \) Chunjiao C. \( GEI \) xiao-le san-tian-san-ye laugh-Asp three-day-three night

4.4. Unexplored Issues

As the attentive reader might notice in the discussion insofar, I do not specify what kind of DP can be s-selected as the Causer argument as well as the Affectee argument, such as animacy and definiteness, if the following sentences are taken into account.

(44)

a. Wu-li shan-lu ba ta gei zou-lei-le
   Five-mile mountain-role BA 3\textsuperscript{rd} GEI walk-tired-Asp
   ‘The five-mile mountain road caused him to walked tired.’.

b. Dianhua lingsheng ba wo gei chao-xing-le
   telephone ring.sound BA 1\textsuperscript{st} GEI bother-awake-Asp
‘The ringing sound of the telephone caused me to feel bothered and wake up.’

c. Ta ba cai gei chao-xian le
3rd BA vegetable GEI fry-salty-Asp
‘He caused the vegetables to be fried and become salty.’

As shown in (44a, b), the Causer argument is not limited to animate objects, *wuli shanlu* ‘five-mile mountain road’ and *dianhua lingsheng* ‘the sound of the telephone’ for instance. This also holds true of the Affectee argument in the pre-GEI position, *cai* ‘vegetables’ in (44c). Aside from the in/animacy specification of the Causer argument and the Affectee argument, there is one issue that I remain silent to in this current paper, types of verb. As noted in Huang,Li and Li (2009), types of verb selected in the BA construction should denote the change-of-state, such resultative constructions as *dashang* ‘hit-hurt’, *dapaole* ‘hit-broken.’ This account might be, nevertheless, challenged by some instances in (45).

(45)
Ta ba xiao-mao gei ai-de wu-fa -zi-ba
3rd BA small-cat GEI love-DE no-way-self-escape
‘He caused the small cat to be loved to a extent that he cannot help himself.’

As shown in (45), the verb *ai* ‘love’ does not denote the change of the state but the grammaticality holds. This suggests that as long as there is another way to license the change-of-state relation in the VP domain, such as degree adverbials, resultatives, complex predicates, the BA construction of this sort, (45) for instance, can hold. For the time being, I leave these specification and subcategorization issues for another occasion. Granted the requirement that other means of licensing the change of the state are present, the current proposed analysis remains intact. I’d like to refer the interested reader to Chang (2000) for more semantic issues about the BA construction.

Before ending this section, assuming the current proposed analysis, six immediate consequences appear, as summarized in (46).

(46)
a. The post-BA DP does not form a constituent with *BA* but is part of *ApplP*{\textsubscript{High}}.
b. *BA* under discussion is not a case-assigner verb, differing from Huang, Li and Li (2009), but a light verb that bears a Causer argument.
c. The *BA* construction consists of the causing event (*vP/VoiceP*) and the caused event which is composed of *ApplP*{\textsubscript{High}} and the complex predicate.
d. *GEI* is the head of Appl$_{\text{High}}$ that license the Affective interpretation on the DP at Spec-Appl$_{\text{High}}$, lending partial support to Tsai’s middle application merged above VP with minor modifications.

e. The *BA* differs from the canonical SVO sentence in having Appl$_{\text{High}}$ whose head is *GEI*.

5. Conclusion

In the present paper, I have argued for the high applicative analysis of the *BA* construction. The *BA* construction entails the occurrence of *GEI*. Building on this observation, I argued that *GEI* is the head of Appl$_{\text{High}}$, assigning dative case as well as the Affectee role to the DP at the edge of Appl$_{\text{High}}$. This line of argumentation not only receives substantial support from causatives in Korean (Kim 2008) but also is theoretically well-grounded in Pylkkänen (2002) and Cuervo (2003). Besides, assuming Kratzer (1996), I argue that *BA*, not being a dummy verb, is a causative head in VoiceP or vP (in Lin’s term 2001), as the causing event, that introduces the Causer argument and selects for the caused event consisting of Appl$_{\text{High}}$ and VP. The proposed analysis of *BA* can cope with the problems noted in Kuo (2009, 2010) and is able to accommodate the maximal degree of variants of the *BA* construction. Granted the proposed analysis, I suggest that the *BA* is not an idiosyncratic construction in MC but shares general properties with other languages if we look at the syntactic topography of the BA construction.

Before ending this paper, I’d like to points one immediate consequence arising from the proposed analysis. In Section 3.2, reviewing Huang’s analysis of indirect passives (1994), I argue that the place where the indirect NP is selected correspond to the Spec of Appl$_{\text{High}}$. Granted this analysis, two well-known passives in MC, short (47a) and long passives (47b)$^{20}$, can be analyzed on a par with the proposed analysis of the BA construction.

(47)

a. Zhiming [vP BEI Appl$_{\text{High}}$ PRO$_i$ [Appl GEI [vP da-si-le ]]]  
   Z. BEI GEI hit-dead-Asp
   ‘Zhiming was hit deal’

b. Zhiming [vP bei [IP OP$_i$ [I’ Chunjiao ….[Appl$_{\text{High}}$ t$_i$ [Appl GEI [vP da-si-le baba ]]]]]]  
   Z. BEI C. GEI hit-dead-Asp father
   ‘Chunjiao’s was hit dead by Zhiming’

$^{20}$There are various to details to be clarified in the *BEI* construction. For the time being, I present a possibility of extending the proposed analysis to the *BEI* construction.
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「把」字句的高施用結構分析：以「給」字句為證

鄭偉成

國立清華大學

本篇論文主旨討論漢語「把」字句的句法分析，將從施用結構(applicative)的角度來描
繪漢語「把」字句的結構。本文所提出的句法分析可以解決各種類型的「把」字句結
構並且解決先前文獻尚未解決的議題。本文有三個目的。首先，我從語料找出反例驗
證，指出 Kuo(2010)對於「把」字句的及物投射分析(Transitivity Projection)以及 Kuo
主張「把」字句的內部結構涵蓋有高施用投射，該結構的中心語可以體現為「給」並
且合併(Merge)於動詞(VP)之上。根據此分析可以解釋「把」字句中帶有蒙受語意
(Affectedness)「把」後(post-BA)名詞的蒙受語意是如何來的。這樣的解釋可以在
結構(Causatives)得到支持。除此之外，「把」字句中可帶有非實格動詞(Unergative
verb)也因此得到解釋。第三，根據施用結構，「把」後的名詞是相對於動詞組中的事
件(Event)，由高施用投射引介而來，而不是移位而來。因此，領屬者提升(posessor
raising)在本文是否定。對於「把」後名詞和動詞內的名詞之間的領屬關係，可以自然
地由高施用結構得到解釋。這樣的觀點從可以 Washio 的語用領屬關係(pragmatic
最後，本文主張的「把」施用分析指出，「把」字句不再是漢語特定的結構，而是和
其它語言的使動結構是類似的。

關鍵字：把字句、高施用結構、蒙受語意、漢語