

УДК 801.8

DOI 10.58649/1694-8033-2024-3(119)-327-332

ЧЖАО ХУАНЬГАЙ

Түндүк-Батыш педагогикалык университети, Эл аралык маданий алмашуу колледжи

ЧЖАО ХУАНЬГАЙ

Северо-Западный педагогический университет, Колледж международного культурного обмена

HUANGAI ZHAO

Northwest Normal University, College of International Cultural Exchange

ЧЕТ ЭЛДИК СТУДЕНТТЕРДИН КЫТАЙ ТИЛИНДЕГИ БЕЛГИСИЗ ПАССИВДҮҮ
СҮЙЛӨМДӨРДҮ "被" ИЕРОГЛИФТҮҮ СҮЙЛӨМ КАТАРЫ ЖАҢЫЛЫШ КОЛДОНУШУНУН
СЕБЕПТЕРИН ТАЛДОО

АНАЛИЗ ПРИЧИН, ПО КОТОРЫМ ИНОСТРАННЫЕ СТУДЕНТЫ НЕПРАВИЛЬНО
ИСПОЛЬЗУЮТ НЕМАРКИРОВАННЫЕ ПАССИВНЫЕ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ В КИТАЙСКОМ
ЯЗЫКЕ КАК ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ С «被»

ANALYZING THE REASONS WHY INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS MISUSE
UNMARKED PASSIVE SENTENCES IN CHINESE AS "BEI" SENTENCES

Кыскача мүнөздөмө: Кытай тилинин пассивдик сүйлөмдөрүн үйрөнүүдө чет өлкөлүк студенттердин эн кенири таралган көйгөйү — Белгисиз пассивдик сүйлөмдөрдү “被” иероглифтүү сүйлөмдөр катары жаңылыш колдонуу. Белгисиз пассивдик сүйлөмдөр жана “被” иероглифтүү сүйлөмдөр боюнча буга чейин көптөгөн изилдөөлөр болгону менен, алардын эч бири студенттердин жаңылыш колдонуу көйгөйүн толук чече алган эмес. Бул макала салыштырмалуу тил илими, жаңылыштыкты анализдөө теориясы, семантика сыяктуу теорияларды жана ыкмаларды колдонуп, белгисиз пассивдик сүйлөмдөрдүн жана “被” иероглифтүү сүйлөмдөрдүн этиштеринин өзгөчөлүктөрүн жана семантикалык белгилерин тактап, Пекин университетинин CCL заманбап кытай тилинин корпусу негизинде «Долбоор» А деңгээлиндеги 282 этишти классификациялаган. Алар тек белгисиз пассивдик сүйлөмдөргө гана кире алган этиштер, тек “被” иероглифтүү сүйлөмдөргө гана таандуу этиштер, эки түрдүү сүйлөмгө тең таандуу этиштер, эки түрдүү сүйлөмгө тең таандуу болбогон этиштер болуп төрт топко бөлүнгөн. Чет өлкөлүк студенттердин белгисиз пассивдик сүйлөмдөрдү “被” иероглифтүү сүйлөмдөр катары жаңылыш колдонушунун себептерин этиштердин тургусунан анализдеген. Бул изилдөө студенттердин мындай жаңылыштыктарын жакшыраак чечүүгө жардам бере алат.

Аннотация: Наиболее распространенной проблемой у иностранных студентов при изучении китайских пассивных предложений является неправильное использование немаркированных пассивных предложений в форме предложений с частицей “被”. Несмотря на многочисленные исследования немаркированных пассивных предложений и предложений с частицей “被”, ни одно из них не смогло должным образом решить проблему неправильного использования студентами. В данной статье основное внимание уделяется теоретическим и методологическим аспектам контрастивной лингвистики, анализу ошибок и семантики. Используя такие теории и методы, как сравнительное языкознание, теория анализа ошибок и семантика, в данной статье уточнены особенности и семантические особенности глаголов неопределенных пассивных предложений и иероглифических предложений «被», а также классифицированы 282 глагола уровня «Проект» А. на основе современного китайского корпуса CCL Пекинского университета. С точки зрения глаголов были проанализированы причины неправильного использования немаркированных пассивных предложений как предложений с частицей “被” иностранными студентами, чтобы лучше решить данную проблему.

Abstract: The most common problem for international students learning Chinese passive sentences is the misuse of unmarked passive sentences as “bei” sentences. Despite numerous studies on unmarked passive sentences and “bei” sentences, none have effectively addressed the issue of students' misuse. This paper draws on theories and methods from contrastive linguistics, error analysis, and

semantics. It examines the characteristics and semantic features of verbs in unmarked passive sentences and "bei" sentences, using the modern Chinese corpus of Peking University (CCL) as a basis. A classification was conducted on 282 verbs from the Grade A word list of the "Outline," categorizing them into four types: verbs that can only be used in unmarked passive sentences, verbs that can only be used in "bei" sentences, verbs that can be used in both types of sentences, and verbs that cannot be used in either type. The reasons for international students' misuse of unmarked passive sentences as "bei" sentences were analyzed from the perspective of verbs, aiming to better address this issue.

Негизги сөздөр: чет өлкөлүк студенттер; белгисиз пассивдик сүйлөмдөр; “被” иероглифтүү сүйлөмдөр; жаңылыш колдонуу.

Ключевые слова: иностранные студенты; немаркированные пассивные предложения; предложения с частицей “被”; неправильное использование.

Keywords: international students; unmarked passive sentences; sentences with the particle “被”; misuse.

Passive sentences have always been a challenging aspect of learning Chinese for international students. Their common issue is the misuse of unmarked passive sentences as "bei" sentences. This paper first classifies 282 Grade A verbs from the "Outline of Chinese Vocabulary and Chinese Characters Level" (hereinafter referred to as the "Outline") based on the "criteria for verbs that can be used in unmarked passive sentences" and the "criteria for verbs that can be used in 'bei' sentences." The verbs are categorized into those that can be used in unmarked passive sentences, those that can be used in "bei" sentences, and those that cannot be used in either type of sentence. Subsequently, in the Peking University CCL corpus, the overlap between verbs that can be used in unmarked passive sentences and those that can be used in "bei" sentences is examined. From this overlap, verbs are further classified into "verbs that can only be used in unmarked passive sentences" and "verbs that can only be used in 'bei' sentences." For convenience in writing, we have adjusted the above results in this paper.

I. Classification Criteria for Verbs that Can Be Used in Unmarked Passive Sentences

The only specialized study on verbs that can be used in unmarked passive sentences is "Unmarked Passive Sentences and Verb Classes" by Wang Canlong (1998: 15-19). Another significant related study is "Explorations in the Grammar of Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language" by Ly Wenhua (2008). Ly Wenhua used descriptive methods to study the characteristics of verbs and nouns in the two sentence structures but provided little analysis of verbs in unmarked passive sentences. The main content of Wang Canlong's article is summarized briefly in this paper. He pointed out the following:

(1) The semantic features of verbs that express actions of animate entities, allowing them to enter unmarked passive sentences, are [+controllable, +strong action, +resultative].

(2) Among verbs that express actions of inanimate entities, the most typical and common are those describing actions caused by natural forces. Due to their semantic features of [+strong action, +resultative], they can also enter unmarked passive sentences.

(3) Verbs describing actions caused by various machines and other objects can also be considered as verbs expressing actions of inanimate entities.

(4) Some objects cannot perform certain actions on their own, but they can sometimes have a significant impact on the people or things that come into contact with them (i.e., they can be resultative).

In comparison, Wang Canlong's summary of verb characteristics in unmarked passive sentences is more straightforward to grasp. Therefore, this paper primarily adopts Wang Canlong's analysis as the main basis for classifying verbs in unmarked passive sentences, with Lü Wenhua's research providing supplementary insights. This study solely considers whether verbs can enter passive sentences (including unmarked passive sentences and "bei" sentences), excluding considerations such as whether passive verbs are followed by complements, dynamic particles, or the types of complements and dynamic particles used.

We believe that by studying verbs at a certain level in the "Outline," similarities and differences in verbs entering unmarked passive sentences and "bei" sentences can be summarized. Therefore, verbs selected for analysis in this paper are primarily based on the "Outline," specifically Grade A words (1033 in total), which are explicitly labeled as "verbs" or have other parts-of-speech annotations (totaling 282 verbs). To ensure objectivity and scientific rigor in classification, each word underwent retrieval in the Peking University CCL Modern Chinese Corpus. Among these, 16 verbs are exclusively used in

unmarked passive sentences, namely: handle (办), change (变), perform (表演), arrive (到), send (发), review (复习), be responsible for (负责), return (回), start (开始), leave (离), trouble (麻烦), try (试), count (数), be accustomed to (习惯), study (学), stand (站).

Upon examining these verbs, we found that most of them commonly take inanimate nouns as objects, rather than animate ones, reflecting a preference for subjects with [+human] characteristics over those with [-human] traits (Xu Dan, 2004).

II. Classification Criteria for Verbs that Can Be Used in "bei" Sentences

In the literature we gathered, there are numerous articles discussing predicate verbs in "bei" sentences, though specialized studies are relatively scarce. Notably thorough among them are Fan Xiao's (2006: 79-89) "Semantic Characteristics of Predicate Verbs in 'bei' Sentences" and Lü Wenhua's (2008) "Explorations in the Grammar of Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language." As mentioned earlier, Lü Wenhua's classification criteria were challenging for us to apply during our analysis. Therefore, for classifying verbs in "bei" sentences, we adopt a similar approach: Fan Xiao's analysis serves as the primary classification criterion, supplemented by Lü Wenhua's research. According to Fan Xiao's perspective, the classification criteria for verbs entering "bei" sentences are summarized as follows:

(1) Typical predicate verbs in "bei" sentences are characterized by [+valency], meaning they are either transitive or trivalent verbs, with a prevalence of transitive verbs.

(2) A small number of monovalent verbs can also appear as predicate verbs in "bei" sentences under specific conditions.

Among the 282 verbs we examined, there are 28 verbs that can only enter "bei" sentences but not unmarked passive sentences. These verbs include: love (爱), help (帮助), compare (比), compare (比较), express (表示), praise (表扬), bring (带), act (1st tone) (当), drop (掉), oppose (反对), visit (访问), care (关心), welcome (欢迎), plan (计划), enter (进), test (考试), lead (领导), crawl (爬), think (认为), agree (同意), unite (团结), hope (希望), laugh (笑), need (需要), request (要求), influence (影响), exercise (运动), point (指).

Some of these words are not commonly used in "bei" sentences, but we have indeed found such instances in our corpus. Besides the distinctions discussed in the studies of Wang Canlong and Fan Xiao regarding verbs that can only enter unmarked passive sentences, there is another significant difference: in sentences where these verbs form the object, both animate and inanimate objects can coexist.

From the analysis above, we know that verbs restricted to unmarked passive sentences commonly take inanimate nouns as objects. In contrast, verbs restricted to "bei" sentences can take both animate and inanimate nouns as objects. When these objects become subjects of the passive construction, subjects in unmarked passive sentences are often inanimate, whereas subjects in "bei" sentences can be either animate or inanimate. This indicates a higher likelihood of using "bei" in sentences where animate objects serve as subjects compared to sentences with inanimate subjects.

III. Verbs that Can Enter Both Unmarked Passive Sentences and "bei" Sentences

There are 156 verbs that can enter both unmarked passive sentences and "bei" sentences. They include:

arrange (安排), place (摆), move (搬), hold (抱), perform (表演), wipe (擦), visit (参观), check (查), sing (唱), eat (吃), draw (抽), wear (穿), blow (吹), hit (打), wear (戴), point (点), throw (丢), understand (懂), move (动), read (读), exercise (锻炼), be hungry (饿), discover (发现), turn over (翻), translate (翻译), put (放), divide (分), enrich (丰富), change (改), change (改变), do (干), do (搞), tell (告诉), give (给), scrape (刮), hang (挂), turn off (关), broadcast (广播), shout (喊), drink (喝), spend (花), paint (画), return (还), change (换), answer (回答), gather (集合), squeeze (挤), send (寄), remember (记), continue (继续), add (加), insist (坚持), check (检查), see (见), build (建设), speak (讲), hand over (交), teach (教), educate (教育), call (叫), connect (接), end (结束), solve (解决), borrow (借), introduce (介绍), conduct (进行), lift (举), decide (决定), open (开), look (看), pull (拉), use (利用), contact (联系), bright (亮), understand (了解), stay (留), buy (买), sell (卖), take (拿), read (念), slap (拍), send (派), run (跑), bump (碰), criticize (批评), break (破), ride (骑), invite (请), get (取得), go (去), let (让), hot (热), recognize (认识), mount (上), produce (生产), left (剩), practice (实践), realize (实现), use (使用), collect (收), tidy up (收拾), lose (输), sleep (睡), say (说), explain (说明), send (送), count (算), raise (抬), talk (谈), discuss (讨论), kick (踢), mention (提), improve (提高), jump (跳), listen (听), stop (停), pass (通过), inform (通知), push (推), retreat (退), take off (脱), complete (完成), play (玩儿), forget (忘), ask

(问), like (喜欢), wash (洗), down (下), believe (相信), want (想), write (写), learn (学习), study (研究), perform (演出), want (要), think (以为), win (赢), use (用), preview (预习), forgive (原谅), increase (增加), exhibit (展览), occupy (占), master (掌握), find (找), take care (照顾), know (知道), live (住), pay attention (注意), install (装), prepare (准备), walk (走), organize (组织), do (做), sit (坐).

Through the analysis of these 156 words, we have identified the following characteristics: whether monosyllabic or disyllabic, in a standalone sentence, they cannot be bare verbs when used in both sentence structures. This means they must be followed by complement elements or dynamic particles (although in context-rich sentences or repetitive "bei" structures, they may appear as bare verbs); they exhibit strong actionality, which when followed by complement elements or dynamic particles can indicate resultant effect or causality; they are mostly polyvalent; there are few polysemous words, generally they are pure verbs, with only 36 out of the 156 words being polysemous, accounting for 23.07% of the total. Among these polysemous words, verbs doubling as nouns are the most frequent, comprising 75% of all polysemous words; verbs doubling as adjectives account for 13.89%; while verbs doubling as auxiliary verbs and prepositions make up 11.11% of all polysemous words. From the above analysis, it is evident that there are relatively few polysemous words among verbs that can be used in both sentence structures. Of these, verbs functioning as nouns and adjectives—essentially as verbs with other real-word meanings—make up the vast majority, totaling 88.89%, with verbs functioning as auxiliary verbs and prepositions representing only a small portion, or 11.11% of the total.

These are the general characteristics of these words. However, there is an exception: "be hungry" ('饿'). While it is not as strongly actional as other words, it shares a causative feature similar to "tired" ('累'). When combined with the character "被" ('bei'), "饿" ('be hungry') can form a "bei" sentence. Furthermore, "be hungry" ('饿') expresses a negative meaning, which aligns with the predominantly negative connotations of "bei" sentences, possibly explaining why "饿" ('be hungry') can be used in "bei" sentences.

IV. Verbs that Cannot Enter Either Unmarked Passive Sentences or "bei" Sentences

There are a total of 82 verbs that cannot enter either unmarked passive sentences or "bei" sentences. They include:

Competition (比赛), change (变化), illness (病), not as good as (不如), participate (参加), differ (差), towards (朝), become (成), arrive late (迟到), go out (出), depart (出发), appear (出现), plan (打算), represent (代表), obtain (得), wait (等), low (低), towards (对), happen (发生), convenient (方便), fly (飞), serve (服务), tutor (辅导), should (该), feel (感到), catch a cold (感冒), thank (感谢), happy (高兴), with (跟), work (工作), enough (够), relationship (关系), pass (过), seem like (好像), can (会), conversation (会话), live (活), moving (活动), go through (经过), feel (觉得), cough (咳嗽), polite (客气), cry (哭), come (来), work (劳动), for example (例如), practice (练习), finish (3rd tone) (了), flow (流), travel (旅行), not (没), warm (暖和), afraid (怕), start (起), few (少), live (生活), win (胜利), be (是), die (死), lie down (躺), ache (疼), dictation (听写), through (通), complete (完), for (2nd tone) (为), for (4th tone) (为), for the sake of (为了), like (像), towards (向), thank you (谢谢), work hard (辛苦), go (行), surname (姓), rest (休息), have (有), willing to (愿意), goodbye (再见), at (在), long (长), wish (祝), do (作).

The characteristics of the above 82 verbs are as follows: most cannot take objects, are non-resultative, and are highly polysemous. Among these 82 verbs, polysemous verbs account for 51.22%, which is much higher compared to the 21.16% found in verbs that can enter both types of sentences. Moreover, among polysemous verbs, 66.66% are verbs that also function as nouns and adjectives, whereas 33.33% are verbs that function as auxiliary verbs or prepositions. This distribution is significantly higher than the 13.79% found among verbs that can enter both sentence types. From this analysis, we can conclude that polysemy is more prevalent among verbs that cannot enter both types of sentences, with verbs that function as nouns and adjectives making up 66.66% of the total, and verbs that function as auxiliary verbs or prepositions making up 33.33%.

Comparing with verbs that can enter both types of sentences mentioned above, we can conclude that simple verbs are more likely to enter passive sentences than polysemous verbs. Verbs that also function as nouns and adjectives are more likely to enter passive sentences than verbs that function as auxiliary verbs or prepositions.

Next, we will summarize the proportions of these various types of verbs and the proportion of polysemous verbs within each type. See Table 1 for details.

Table 1

Proportion and quantity Classification of verbs	the proportion and quantity of words of this type	the proportion and number of concurrent words in this type of words	
		the proportion and number of verbs and other substantive words	the proportion and number of verbs and other function words
can only be used in unmarked passive sentences	5.67% 16	37.5% (6)	
		83.33% 5	16.67% 1
can only be used in "bei" sentences	9.93% 28	39.29% (11)	
		90.91% 10	9.09% 1
both sentence patterns can be entered	55.32% 156	23.07% (36)	
		88.89% 32	11.11% 4
neither sentence pattern can be entered	29.08% 82	51.22% (42)	
		66.66% 28	33.33% 14
total	100 282	—	—

V. Summary

Through the analysis of the above verbs, we can draw the following conclusions:

Firstly, verbs that can only enter into unmarked passive sentences are relatively few, and these verbs often take non-living nouns as their objects. Therefore, unmarked passive sentences are more strictly limited in terms of the type of object they can take compared to "被" sentences.

Secondly, verbs that can only enter into "被" sentences do not have strict restrictions on their objects; they can take both animate and inanimate objects. This means that the subject of a "被" sentence can be either animate or inanimate.

Thirdly, verbs that can enter into both sentence structures constitute a large proportion. Among the 282 Grade A verbs in the "Outline," they make up more than half. This situation often confuses students who may not know whether to use an unmarked passive sentence or a "被" sentence. Additionally, our teaching emphasizes the "被" sentence for expressing passivity, which contributes to why students often misuse unmarked passive sentences as "被" sentences.

References

1. Office of the National Chinese Language Teaching Committee. Outline of Chinese Proficiency Vocabulary and Characters[M]. Beijing: Beijing Language Institute Press, 1992.
2. Wang Canlong. "Unmarked Passive Sentences and Types of Verbs" [J]. Chinese Language Learning, 1998, (5): 15-19.
3. Lü Wenhua. Exploring Grammar in Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language [M]. Beijing: Beijing Language University Press, 2008.
4. Xu Dan, translated by Zhang Zujian. Introduction to Chinese Syntax [M]. Beijing: Beijing Language University Press, 2004.
5. Fan Xiao. "Semantic Features of Predicative Verbs in '被' Sentences" [J]. Changjiang Academic Journal, 2006 (2): 79-89.
6. Lu Jianming. "Several Issues Regarding Passive Sentences" [J]. Journal of Chinese Linguistics, 2004, (2): 9-16.