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In this dissertation four Japanese constructions—the passive, the spontaneous, the honorific, and the potential—are examined. My goal is to provide a unified account of the syntactic function of the suffixes used in these constructions, which have phonetically similar forms and which are said to have arisen from a common source.

I argue that the suffixes in question all downgrade the external role of the base verb, i.e., they prevent its association with the syntactically prominent specifier of IP position. In the case of passives, the external role of the base verb remains within the verbal projection, where it is realized as a postpositional phrase and hence does not get associated with the specifier of IP. In the case of the spontaneous, the suffix simply deletes the external role, thereby preventing it being realized in the specifier position. In the case of the subject honorific, the suffix prevents the external role from moving into the syntactically prominent specifier of IP position, so that the argument remains within the verbal projection. Finally, in the case of the potential, the suffix suppresses the external role through coindexing with another coreferential argument of the base verb, thereby preventing its realization.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

An important issue in current linguistic research has to do with the interaction between syntax and morphology. Particularly close attention has been paid to the passive construction, for which various analyses have been proposed. Cross-linguistic studies of this construction have yielded a very interesting finding that will constitute the focal point of this dissertation: the same morphology that appears in the passive is also quite often found in a variety of other constructions. For instance, the reflexive pronoun se in Spanish is employed not only for the passive but also in three other patterns. (The following data is cited by Shibatani (1985).)

Spanish (Givón 1979: 194; Deguchi 1982: 307, 314)

(1) a. Passive
   Se curó a los brujos.
   cured-3sg. Dat the sorcerers
   'The sorcerers were cured.'

b. Reflexive
   Se curaron los brujos
   cured-3pl the sorcerers
   'The sorcerers cured themselves.'

c. Reciprocal
   Juan y María se vieron en la calle
   Juan and Maria saw-3pl in the street
   'Juan and Maria saw each other in the street.'
d. Spontaneous

Se abrió la puerta.

open-3sg the door

'The door opened.'

In some languages (e.g. Ainu, Hindi, etc.), the same morphology that occurs in passives also appears in honorifics and/or 'potentials' (the rough equivalent of English *can* or *-able* constructions). In the case of Spanish, the common morpheme happens to be a free lexical item, but in other languages (e.g. Quechua, Chamorro, etc), it is often a bound morpheme. According to Shibatani (1985), the multiple use of the morpheme associated with the passive is also found in the following language families.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Uses of the passive morpheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
<td>Tetelcingo Nahuatl</td>
<td>passive, reflexive, reciprocal, honorific and potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean-Equatorial</td>
<td>Quechua</td>
<td>passive, reflexive, reciprocal, honorific, and spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altaic</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>passive, reflexive and potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>passive, reflexive, reciprocal, potential and spontaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cook (1990) also reports the multiple use of the passive suffix in Samoan.

Japanese is another language in which passive morphology (the suffix -(r)are) is used in constructions other than the passive. In contemporary Japanese, the passive suffix is used for potentials and honorifics in addition to passives. (Potentials exhibit different allomorphic patterns; see section 2.1.2)
(2) Passive
Taroo ga Hanako ni hatak-are-ta
Taroo Nm Hanako obl hit-Pas-Pst
'Taroo was hit by Hanako.'

(3) Potential
Taroo ga ne-rare-na-katta
Taroo Nm sleep-Pot-Neg-Pst
'Taroo could not sleep.'

(4) Honorific
Sensee ga tat-are-ta
Teacher Nm stand-Hon-Pst
'The teacher stood up.'

In medieval Japanese, the same morphology was also used in the spontaneous construction. (See section 2.1.) In modern Japanese, however, the spontaneous suffix no longer has the same form as that of passives; i.e., it is now -e rather than -(r)are.

(5) Spontaneous
Madogarasu ga war-e-ta
window-glass Nm break-Spon-Pst
'The window glass broke.'

The central thesis of this dissertation is that various uses of -(r)are and its morphological cognates can be unified in accordance with the following proposal by Johns (1992).
(6) Where morphemes are identical or similar in phonological properties, in the unmarked case, they are identical or similar in all lexical properties.

An idea along these lines has been pursued by Shibatani (1985), who claims that the factors underlying the formal similarity of the Japanese constructions reviewed above are neither strictly semantic nor (morpho)syntactic. Rather, he claims, the various constructions can be related to each other in terms of a common pragmatic function of 'agent defocusing' or 'downgrading' which can be manifested in various ways. These ways include (i) deletion of an agent, (ii) mention of an agent in a non-prominent syntactic position, and (iii) blurring of the identity of an agent by the use of plural, or of indefinite forms.

It is my goal to show that the various Japanese constructions that make use of -(r)are and its cognates can be unified on the grounds that they all involve a type of syntactic downgrading. Shibatani's observation that the agent in these constructions is "pragmatically" defocused may well be correct, but I believe that their formal similarity of these patterns is syntactically motivated, and that any shared pragmatic function is secondary.

The organization of this dissertation is as follows. In chapter 2, I will present a brief description of each of the four constructions and of how the suffixes used in them developed in the history of Japanese language. In chapter 3, I will outline some of the assumptions of Government and Binding (GB) theory, focusing on
those aspects of the theory that are relevant to this thesis. I then
discuss the specific assumptions about affixation that I am adopting
from Roeper's (1987) theory. In subsequent chapters, I present my
analysis of each construction.
2.1 Japanese p-suffix constructions

In Japanese, the suffixes used in the passive, potential, spontaneous, and honorific constructions all arose from a common source, though not all of them have an identical form in contemporary Japanese. In this chapter, a brief introduction is given for each construction. Following Kanno (1989) I will use the term ‘p-suffixes’ to refer to the suffixes that enter into the formation of these patterns.

2.1.1 The passive construction.

A curious fact about the passive suffix in Japanese is that it can be attached not only to a transitive verb (as in direct passives, corresponding roughly to the English passive) but also to an intransitive verb (in indirect passives). Examples of the direct passive and indirect passive are given in (1) and (2).

(1) Direct passive: base verb = taihos- ‘to arrest’ [Agent, Theme]
    Taroo ga taihos-are-ta
    Taroo Nm arrest-Pas-Pst
    ‘Taroo was arrested.’
(2) **Indirect passive:** base verb = nak- ‘to cry’  [Agent]
Taroo ga kodomo ni nak-are-ta
Taroo Nm child Obl cry-Pas-Pst
‘Taroo was affected by the child’s crying.’

Although languages like Dutch and German allow an impersonal passive to be built upon an intransitive verb, the indirect passive in Japanese is a completely different construction. Compare (2) with the following sentence, which is an example of an impersonal passive in German.

(3) **Impersonal passive**  (Perlmutter and Postal 1983: 26)
Es wird hier getanzt
it was here danced
‘It was danced here.’

In both the impersonal and the indirect passive, the logical subject of the base verb is demoted (in the example given above it is not expressed.) But notice that in the impersonal passive the subject position is filled with an expletive, whereas in the indirect passive, it is filled with an argument (the NP *Taroo*) which is not part of the theta grid of the base verb. (The verb *nak-* ‘to cry’ in (2) does not take a complement, hence *kodomo* ‘child’ is its only argument.)

The indirect passive is also possible with a transitive verb, as illustrated by the following example:
(4) **Indirect passive with a transitive verb:**

base verb = *taihos-* ‘to arrest’ [ Agent, Theme]
Kisi-san ga Ito-san ni (saki ni) hannin o taihos-are-ta.
Kisi-Mr. Nm Ito-Mr Obl (first) suspect Ac arrest-Pas-Pst
‘Mr. Kisi was affected by Mr. Ito’s arresting a suspect first.’

I provide a detailed analysis of indirect passives in chapter 6.

2.1.2 The potential construction

In contemporary Japanese, the suffix used for the potential shows a pattern of morphological variation different from the passive (see the next section). Potentials also have two subtypes: (i) the passive potential, which corresponds roughly to the *-able* construction in English, and (ii) the active potential, which expresses one’s ability or potential.

(5) a. **Passive potential**

Kono kinoko ga tabe-rare-ru
this mushroom Nm eat-Pot-Pre
‘These mushrooms are eatable.’

b. **Active Potential**

Taroo ga sasimi ga tabe-rare-na-i
Taroo Nm sashimi Nm eat-Pot-Neg-Pre.
‘Taroo cannot eat sashimi.’

An active potential can be built from an intransitive as well as a transitive verb, whereas a passive potential is normally derived only from a transitive verb¹.
(6) **Active potential derived from an intransitive verb**

Taroo ga moo aruk-e-na-i
Taroo Nm already walk-Pot-Neg-Pre
'Taroo can walk already.'

The active potential is used solely to express the ability of a person (and/or animal) to carry out an event. It therefore does not take an inanimate nominal as its subject. Note that English potentials do not have this kind of restriction:

(7) **English**

a. **With an animate subject**
John can speak French.

b. **With an inanimate subject**
This metal can block x-rays.

(8) **Japanese**

a. **With an animate subject**
John ga huransugo ga hanas-e-ru
John Nm French Nm speak-Pot-Pres
'John can speak French.'

b. **With an inanimate subject**
*Kono kinzoku ga hoosyasen ga saegir-e-ru
this metal Nm x-ray Nm block-Pot-Pres
'This metal can block x-rays.'

As these examples illustrate, an inanimate nominal is not allowed to be the subject of the Japanese potential construction.
2.1.3 The spontaneous construction

The third p-suffix construction is the spontaneous. (The term 'middle passive' has also been used for the construction.) This construction is used to encode an event that takes place spontaneously without the perceived intervention of an agent. As mentioned in chapter one, the form of the spontaneous suffix in modern Japanese (-e) is different from that of the other p-suffixes.

(9) **Spontaneous**
Kono hon ga yoku ur-e-ru
this book Nm well sell-Spon-Pre
'This book sells well.'

This construction is built only upon a transitive verb.

2.1.4 The honorific construction

Finally, the honorific is used to express the speaker's respect for the referent of a subject phrase.

(10) **Honorific**
Sensee ga hasir-are-ta
teacher Nm run-Hon-Pst
'The teacher ran.'

The suffix used in the honorific shows the same allomorphic variation as that of the passive.
Table 2.1 depicts the various uses of the Japanese p-suffixes, and categorizes them on the basis of the verb type with which they occur.

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures with p-suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built upon only transitive verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The direct passive and indirect passive have been studied intensively, although there has been considerable dispute over their analysis (Kuno 1973, 1983; Howard and Niyekawa-Howard 1976). The other constructions have been less studied, and have generally been considered totally distinct from the passive structure because of differences in their semantics and allomorphic variation.

2.2 Historical and synchronic status of p-suffixes

In this section, the diachronic and synchronic status of the p-suffixes will be discussed. Because of terminological confusion, there seem to be different opinions about the form of p-suffix in each construction.
Table 2.2 illustrates the suffixes used for each construction in contemporary Japanese (1868 to the present). Verbs are classified into two groups: (i) those which have the thematic structure [Cognizer, Theme] (basically emotive and cognitive verbs such as *kira-u* 'dislike', and *kanzi-ru* 'feel'), and (ii) those which have the thematic structure [Agent, Theme], (e.g. *nom-u* 'drink,' *but-u* 'hit,' etc). I call the former 'psychological verbs' and the latter 'nonpsychological verbs.' With psychological verbs, there is a uniform suffix *-(r)are* used throughout the paradigm. However, with nonpsychological verbs, the suffix *-e* is used in addition to *-(r)are* for potential verbs and is the only form used for spontaneous verbs. (As I will show in a later chapter, psychological verbs do not occur in the spontaneous construction.)

Table 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psychological verbs: [Cognizer, Theme]</th>
<th>Non-psychological verbs: [Agent, Theme]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-(r)are</td>
<td>-(r)are/(-e)²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It has been claimed that {-\(r\)are} is also used for the spontaneous. (Shibatani 1985) But I will show in chapter 5 that this is not, and that the sentences given as examples of this are really passives which have spontaneous meaning.

What is the status of the suffix -\(e\) in the potential and spontaneous? The history of Japanese provides an answer to this question. Table 2.3 presents a short summary of the historical development of the p-suffixes of modern Japanese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Japanese</th>
<th>Medieval</th>
<th>Early Modern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>-(y)/-(r)</td>
<td>(ra)r</td>
<td>-(ra)r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>-(ra)r/-(e)</td>
<td>-(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>-(y)</td>
<td>-(ra)r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorifics</td>
<td>-(ra)r</td>
<td>-(ra)r</td>
<td>-(r)are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early Old Japanese -\(r\), which is the direct antecedent of -(r)are, coexisted with the suffix -\(y\) in passive verbs (Miller 1967: 325). It is unknown what the exact functions of these two morphemes were, but they almost certainly differed in some way, since distinct forms with identical functions are rare in human language. Based on the
use of these suffixes with passive verbs, Yoshida (1973) claims that 
\(-r\) expressed objectivity, and \(-y\) subjectivity. There is good evidence 
that \(-y\) tended to occur with verbs that express subjective 
experiences. In the \textit{Manyoosyuu}, a collection of poems written 
between the fifth and eighth centuries, there are approximately 421 
uses of \(-y\). Over 90 percent of these occur with either sensory, 
emotive, or cognitive verbs. For instance, \textit{mi-y-u} ‘to be seen’ appears 
205 times, \textit{omoho-y-u} ‘to be thought’ 133 times, \textit{sira-y-u} ‘to be 
known’ 13 times, and so on. Although there are not many passive 
verbs with \(-r\) in \textit{Manyoosyuu}, this suffix is found with the kind of 
verbs with which \(-y\) does not appear (e.g. \textit{iha-r-u} ‘to be said’, 
\textit{tukahasa-r-u} ‘to be sent,’ etc.).

Although \(-y\) was also used for the potential in early Old 
Japanese, it had disappeared almost totally by the Heian period 
(794-1192), and had been replaced by \(-r\) not only in the passive but 
also in the potential as well. Japanese scholars (e.g. Wada 1969 and 
Nishida 1969) share the view that \(-r\) in Old Japanese was already 
used with structures expressing potential and passive meanings. 
This \(-r\) became \(-(ra)r\) in Medieval Japanese, and \-(r)are\ in Modern 
Japanese.

According to Komatsu (1969), the use of \(-e\) for the spontaneous 
developed from the passive suffix and is attested as early as the 
Muromachi period (1336-1573), although it seems to have been 
limited to certain verbs. The use of \(-e\) with potential verbs also
dates back to the Muromachi period (Yanagida 1985), but its spread started in the Meiji period (1868-1912) (Komatsu 1969). Although the reason for this historical development is unclear, there is agreement (Martin 1975 and Teramura 1982) that this -e is currently an allomorph of -(r)are in the potential, and that it is not a separate morpheme.

In summary, the history of the Japanese language indicates that the suffixes used in the passive, potential, and spontaneous constructions (the p-suffixes) arose from a common source and that the suffix used with the spontaneous took a second step and developed into another form.

The conclusion that -e in the spontaneous is now an independent morpheme whereas -e in the potential is an allomorph of -(r)are is further supported by a number of synchronic facts. The first fact involves the distribution of -(r)are and -e with potential and spontaneous verbs. In the former class, -e is attached to consonant stem verbs and -(r)are to vowel-stem verbs. In the latter, on the other hand, there is no such complementary distribution since -e is attached to vowel stem verbs as well as consonant-stem verbs.

(11) Potential
a. Consonant stem verb       b. Vowel stem verb
nom- --> nom-e-              tabe- --> tabe-rare-
drink   can drink             eat     can eat
(12) Spontaneous

a. Consonant stem verb.

\[ \text{hodok-} \rightarrow \text{hodok-e-} \]
untie X \ X unties

b. Vowel stem verb

\[ \text{ni-} \rightarrow \text{ni-e-} \]
cook X \ X cooks

A second difference has to do with the fact that the \(-e/-(r)are\) alternation in the potential is not observed in all dialects. According to Martin (1975:300-301), there are two conflicting tendencies: one is to use only \(-(r)e\), a shortened form of \(-(r)are\), for all potentials, thus formally differentiating them from the passive, and the other is to use only \(-(r)are\), which is common in northern Japan. These tendencies led in many areas to free variation, or competition, between the two forms. Standard Japanese takes a middle course: it uses the long form \(-(r)are\) for the potential of vowel stem verbs, and the short form \(-e\) for the potential of consonant stem verbs. In contrast, the spontaneous does not exhibit this kind of dialectal difference.

A related argument involves quasi-idiomatic expressions. As mentioned earlier, the use of \(-e\) as a variation of the potential suffix appeared in the Meiji era (1868-1912) (Komatsu 1969). Interestingly, in quasi-idiomatic expressions, which are less subject to change over time, \(-(r)are\) is preferred over \(-e\) even today for the potential form of consonant stem verbs. (Recall that \(-e\) is the
expected allomorph for the potential of consonant stem verbs.) The following examples are taken from Teramura (1982:256).

(13)a. Naku ni nak-are-nu kimoti.
    cry Loc cry-RARE-Neg feeling.
    ‘The feeling that I cannot cry.’

b. ??naku ni nak-e-nu kimoti

(14) a Iu ni iw-are-nu kurushimi
    say Loc say-RARE-Neg suffering
    ‘The suffering that I cannot express.’

b. ??iu ni i-e-nu kurushimi

Taken together, these diachronic and synchronic facts indicate that -e in the potential is an allomorph of -(r)are, but that -e in the spontaneous is not.

2.3 Summary

In this chapter, we have presented a brief introduction to each of the Japanese p-suffix constructions from both a diachronic and a synchronic perspective.
Notes

1. It has been pointed out to me by John Haig that a sentence like the following is possible and has a passive potential-like interpretation although the base verb is intransitive.

(i) Kono hen de wa oyog-e-na-i
    This area Loc Top swim-RARE-Neg-Pres
    'This area is not swimable.'

This is true, but without the adjunct locative phrase, this sentence is not acceptable.

(ii) *Oyog-e-na-i
    swim-RARE-Neg-Pres
    'It is not swimable.'

It may well be the case that passive potentials can built from certain types of non-transitive verbs, but I will not go into this matter in this dissertation.

2. Not all psychological verbs can be converted into potentials. In particular, quite a few emotive verbs cannot. For example:

   (i) Taroo ga John o natukasim-u
       Taroo Nm John Ac miss-Pres
       'Taroo misses John.'

   (ii) *Taroo ga John ga natukasim-e-ru
       Taroo Nm John Nm miss-Pot-Pres
       'Taroo can miss John.'
CHAPTER 3
Government and Binding theory and Roeper’s affixation theory

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will outline some of the assumptions of the Government and Binding (GB) theory, focusing on those aspects of the theory that are relevant to this dissertation. I will then briefly introduce how this theory treats passives. Lastly, I will discuss the specific assumptions from Roeper’s (1987) affixation theory that I am adopting.

3.2 GB theory

There are numerous variants of GB theory. The basic assumptions that I am adopting here are those of Chomsky (1981, 1986a), which give a grammar with the following organization:

(1)

\[ \text{Lexicon} \]
\[ \text{D-Structure} \]
\[ \text{Syntactic Move-alpha} \]
\[ \text{S-structure} \]
\[ (\text{LF Move-alpha}) \]
\[ \text{Phonetic Form (PF)} \]
\[ \text{Logical Form (LF)} \]
As shown above, four levels of representations are assumed: D-structure, S-structure, Phonetic Form (PF), and Logical Form (LF).

D-structure is a formal syntactic level of representation at which the thematic relations among items and phrases are represented structurally in the manner outlined below. D-structure is converted into S-structure by the transformational rule called Move-alpha, which is sometimes paraphrased as "move anything anywhere." This does not mean that every move is allowed since there are independent principles which dictate what can move and where it can move to. We will discuss some of these principles a little later in this section.

S-structure serves as the input to the rules that yield Phonetic Form and Logical Form. Phonetic Form represents the actual physical properties of the utterance (i.e. its pronunciation) while Logical Form is the representation of grammatically determined aspects of a sentence’s meaning (e.g. pronoun interpretation, quantifier scope, etc).

The syntactic levels of representation (i.e., all but PF) are properly related to one another only if they jointly satisfy the Projection Principle stated in (2).

(2) Projection Principle

Representations at every syntactic level are projected from the lexicon, in that they observe subcategorization properties of lexical items. Chomsky (1981:29)
What this means is that representations at each syntactic level must respect the selectional properties of individual lexical items (cf. Chomsky 1981: 29). For example, if the verb selects a direct object NP as a lexical property, then at each level of the representation it must occur with a complement of that type.

The Projection Principle is satisfied not only by simple declarative sentences such as (3a), but also by structures such as (3b), which are formed with the help of a movement rule.

(3) a. You can hit the ball.
   b. Which ball can you hit?

In GB theory, it is assumed that the complement in (3b) is moved to the front of the sentence from the direct object position. Hence, this sentence has the following D-structure and S-structure (simplifying somewhat).

(4) a. D-structure: [ you can hit which ball ]
   b. S-structure: [ which ball i can you hit [NP t_i ] ]

The NP which ball occurs in the object position at D-structure, and then is moved to the beginning of the sentence. As illustrated in (4b), the movement operation leaves an empty NP in the object position. Called a trace and coindexed with the moved Wh word, this NP allows the Projection Principle to be satisfied in this structure.
since it corresponds to the direct object NP required by the lexical properties of the verb *hit*.

The Projection Principle is only one of a number of different principles that constrain the representation of sentences and the operation of Move alpha in GB theory. The other principles are usually divided into the following eight subtheories or 'modules'.

(5)  a. X-bar theory  
    b. Theta theory  
    c. Case theory  
    d. Binding theory  
    e. Control theory  
    f. Government theory  
    g. Bounding theory  
    h. Predication theory

I will provide a brief discussion of only those principles that are relevant to the points to be raised in this dissertation. For more detailed discussion of the theory in general, see Haegeman (1991) or Lasnik & Uriagarecka (1988).

3.2.1 X-bar theory

The first subtheory with which we are concerned is X-bar theory. It provides the basic configurations of phrase structure which are relevant for the way in which lexical properties are
"projected" onto phrase structure. The basic configuration for phrase structure, called the X-bar schema, is depicted in (6):

(6) \[
\begin{array}{c}
XP \\
\text{specifier} \\
X^0 \\
\text{complements}
\end{array}
\]

(Complements and specifiers may or may not be present.)

The X-bar schema imposes two basic requirements:

(7) a. Every phrase must have a head.
   b. All X^0s are projected up to the X' and XP level.

It is generally assumed that languages share these properties, although they may differ with regards to the positions of complements and specifiers. For instance, in Japanese complements precede the head whereas in English they follow it, just as the template above illustrates. Hence, in Japanese the object NP precedes the verb while in English it follows the verb:

(8) Japanese
    John ga Mary o sikat-ta
    John Nm Mary Ac scold-Pst
    ‘John scolded Mary.’
X-bar theory does not dictate the linear position (pre-head vs post-head) of a complement or specifier. Rather, this is determined by language-specific independent properties.

Each phrase is labeled according to the category of the head. There are six syntactic categories, which can be grouped into two classes: lexical categories and functional categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples from English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>lexical</td>
<td>dog, chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>lexical</td>
<td>hit, go, jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>lexical</td>
<td>difficult, cheap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>lexical</td>
<td>in, on, at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>functional</td>
<td>tense, will, may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>functional</td>
<td>that, whether,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 2, there are four lexical categories: Noun (N), Verb (V), Adjective (A), and Preposition/(or Postposition in some languages) (P). Two functional categories complete the system: Inflection (I or Infl) and Complementizer (C or Comp). Comp includes
complementizers of various kinds while Infl contains Tense, Agr (agreement features) and/or modals.

The following tree diagram helps illustrate the organization of phrase structure. (I deal with the placement of the subject in section 3.2.2 below.)

(10) a. that they drink beer

b. D-structure:

```
CP
  /\           
/C\           /
  \    \      
   \ that
     /
    IP
      /
     NP
       /
      e
       /
      Pres
      /
     NP
      /
     they
      /
     V
      /
     NP
       /
      drink beer
```

It has occasionally been claimed (Fukui 1986) that Japanese does not have functional categories (i.e. Infl and Comp), but I assume here that it does. In this, I follow Baker (1988) and Whitman (1988), among others.

3.2.2 Theta theory

Theta theory deals with the representation and assignment of theta roles. Theta roles are listed in the ‘theta grid’ that is associated
with lexical items along with their subcategorization frame in the lexicon. Let's take the verb *hit* as an example.

(11) hit : [ ___ NP] < Agent, Theme>

*Hit* subcategorizes an NP as its direct object and determines two thematic roles—an agent and theme. Theta roles are assigned to arguments under the following conditions.

(12) • V assigns its theme role to an argument in complement position.
    • V assigns its agent role to an argument in specifier position.

According to these conventions, a head assigns the thematic roles in its grid to arguments that it governs. We define government as follows:

(13) Government (cf. Chomsky1986b: 8)
    A governs B iff A c-commands B and there is no barrier between A and B.
    Governors are heads.

(14) C-command\(^1\)
    A c-commands B iff A does not dominate B and every maximal projection that dominates A also dominates B.
The precise notion of barrier is a technical matter whose details are not relevant here. The following definition suffices for our purposes.

(15) Barrier

All XPs are barriers unless they are theta-marked complements.

(16)

In this example, the verb *hit* governs the two NPs since it c-commands both and there is no intervening barrier. In accordance with the conventions in (12), the theme role is assigned to the complement *a dog* and the agent role to the subject *John*.

The traditional view is that the subject argument occurs outside of the verbal projection in the specifier position of IP. However, as can be seen from the above tree, I follow Fukui & Speas (1986) in assuming that the subject argument occurs in the specifier position of VP in D-structure. (This is sometimes called the ‘VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis’.) Hence, every theta role is uniformly assigned under one structural relation, namely government. This also allows us to assign theta roles uniformly regardless of the category. Compare the following examples:
(17) a. The enemy destroyed the city.
   b. The enemy’s destruction of the city.

The verb *destroy* and the noun *destruction* have the same theta grid: [Agent, Theme]. In the traditional view, the agent role in a clause is assigned to an argument outside of the verbal projection while the theme role is assigned to an argument within the projection. At the same time within a NP both roles are assigned to arguments inside the nominal projection. The following trees illustrate this.

(18) Thematic role assignment in the VP-External approach

a. Within a clause

```
      IP
      /   \
     /     \
   NP      I'
   |       /  \   \
 The enemy I     VP
      |     /   \ \
 Past V'   V [AG, TH]
             /  \  |
         destroyed       NP
                           /  \  \
                          the city
```

b. Within a NP

```
      NP
      /   \
     /     \
   NP     N'
   |     /  \   \
 the enemy's N [AG, TH] PP
          /  \  |
        destruction of the city
```
On the other hand, according to the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis, the agent role is assigned to the argument which is in the specifier position of VP. Hence, it allows for all the theta roles to be assigned to arguments within the projection of the head, regardless of whether it is V or N.

(19) Thematic role assignment in the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis

Note that the subject does not stay in the specifier position that it occupies in D-structure. Rather, it is forced to move into the specifier of IP position by other principles to be discussed below.

There is still another argument to support the VP-internal subject hypothesis (mentioned in Chomsky 1992). Consider the following sentence, in which the verb phrase is preposed.

(20) ...and [behave herself], she will.

The reflexive pronoun herself is a special type of nominal (called an anaphor) and, as such, it must have a c-commanding antecedent at S-
structure. If we assume that the subject *she* is in the specifier of IP position in D-structure and that the VP is then preposed, there is no antecedent which c-commands the reflexive at S-structure. This is illustrated in (21) below.

(21) a. D-structure: [ She will [VP behave herself] ]
    b. S-structure: [ [VP behave *herself]* she will *ti* ]

However, according to the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis, the subject occurs in the specifier position of VP in D-structure. It then moves to the specifier of IP position, at which point the VP is preposed. The reflexive therefore has a c-commanding antecedent—the trace in the specifier of VP left by the subject NP *she*. 
(22) D-Structure: [ will [VP she behave herself] ]

--> NP movement

[ she ] will [VP tj behave herself] ]

--> VP preposing

S-structure: [ [VP tj behave herself] she will tj ]

antecedent--->

for herself

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{VP}_i \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{VP}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP}_j \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{V'}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
tj \\
\text{behave } herself
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
she \\
\text{will } tj
\end{array}
\]

3.2.3 Predication theory

The predication theory is concerned with how nonargument phrases are licensed; i.e., it deals with the distribution and interpretation of VPs and similar 'predicate' phrases. I propose the following principle, which is based loosely on Rothstein's (1985) proposal.

(23) Condition on predication

In personal constructions, a predicate must be linked (by coindexing) with an argument with which it enters into a mutual c-command relation.
The predicate that we are concerned with here is VP. According to the condition on predication, it must be coindexed with an argument in the specifier of IP position. Thus, I assume that unless otherwise prohibited the highest argument in D-structure moves into the specifier of IP position so that the VP can be predicated of it. This ensures the movement of the subject NP from the specifier of VP to the specifier of IP in examples such as the following.

(24)

3.2.4 Case theory

Case theory determines the assignment of (abstract) Case to NPs and their distribution in S-structure. In GB theory each overt NP must be assigned Case.

(25) The Case Filter (Chomsky 1986: 74)

Every phonetically realized NP must be assigned (abstract) Case.
If an overt NP does not receive Case, then the sentence is ruled out.

Certain lexical items, e.g. transitive verbs, prepositions (or postpositions) and tensed Infls, are Case assigners. They assign their Case to an NP that they govern. For example, in English tensed Infl governs the NP in the specifier of IP and is a nominative Case assigner; V governs the object NP and is an accusative Case assigner. The Case assigner and the Case enter into one-to-one correspondence. Thus, tensed Infl always assigns a single nominative Case, a transitive verb always assigns a single accusative Case, and so on. The following tree diagram helps illustrate the Case assignment system of English.

(26) a. Mary loves John.

S-structure:

```
   IP
  /   \
 /     \ 
NPi    I'
  |     |
Mary   IP
       /  \ 
      /    \ 
     <Nom> [+Pres] VP
          /    \ 
         /     \ 
 NP     V'   NP
        /  \    /
     t_i loves John
```

Recall that according to the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis the subject moves from the specifier of VP to that of IP. This tree also illustrates why this movement is necessary. If the argument stays in the specifier of VP position, it cannot receive Case since there is no
Case available in this position. To avoid a violation of the Case Filter, it therefore moves into the specifier of IP position, where Nominative Case is available.

Languages differ with regard to the categories which assign Case and the conditions under which Case assignment occurs. In Japanese, for example, Infl is not a case assigner. Consider the following sentence.

(27) **Japanese sentence with no nominative Case**
    Ano kaisha de sono kusuri o utte iru.
    that company Loc that medicine Ac sell-Prg.
    ‘The company is selling the medicine.’

As mentioned above, Case assigners and Case enter into a one-to-one correspondence. Assuming that each sentence has an Infl, then it should also contain a single nominative marked NP. However, there is no nominative case in sentence (27).

Now consider another example.

(28) **Japanese sentence with two nominative Case**
    John ga nihongo ga dekiru.
    John Nm Japanese Nm can-do.
    ‘John can speak Japanese.’

Here, there are two NPs marked with the nominative Case marker *ga*, even though there is only one Infl. This once again suggests that nominative Case in Japanese is assigned independently of Infl.
I assume here that nominative Case in Japanese is assigned 'contextually' to an NP in the specifier position of either IP or VP. (A similar idea is put forward within slightly different versions of GB by Saito (1985), Kuroda (1989) and Fukui (1986).)

The following table summarizes the differences in Case assignment in English and Japanese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Case assigner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>tensed Infl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>Transitive V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Context: [ IP — [I’ ] ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ VP — [v’ ] ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>Transitive V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.5 Control theory

Up to this point, we have not dealt with the following sentence type.

(29) a. I tried to work hard.

b. D-structure: I tried [to PRO work hard ]

c. S-structure: I tried [PROi to ti work hard.]
The verb *work* in this sentence requires an agentive subject, but there is no overt NP corresponding to this argument. In GB, it is assumed that a "silent" nominal called PRO occurs as the subject of the lower clause in order to respect the Extended Projection Principle.

(30) Extended Projection Principle

Every clause must have a subject (in the specifier of IP).

Control theory is concerned with the interpretation and distribution of PRO, of which there are two types:

(i) Obligatory controlled PRO:

PRO which has to have an antecedent

(ii) Arbitrary PRO

PRO which does not have an antecedent and has an arbitrary interpretation.

An example of obligatory control is found in (29) above, where PRO is necessarily coreferential with the nominal in the higher clause. Now compare this with the situation in the following sentence.

(31) To deceive someone is disgusting.

S-structure: [PRO to deceive someone] is disgusting
Notice that PRO in this sentence is not coreferential with any nominal in the sentence; rather, it has the interpretation of "anyone". This is an example of arbitrary PRO.

The two types of PRO differ in terms of interpretation, but they share an important distributional property. In particular, neither can occur in a position to which Case is assigned by a head (e.g. tensed Infl, V, P). As discussed in the Case theory section, the complement of V and the specifier of tensed Infl in English are Case-marked positions. Hence, PRO cannot occur in those positions.

\[(32) \quad \text{a. } * \text{ I believe } [\text{ that PRO went to Japan. }] \]
\[\text{b. } * \text{ John } [\text{V'} \text{ hit } [\text{NP PRO}]] \]

The only position in which either type of PRO can occur is the specifier of untensed IP. (Recall that no Case is assigned to this position.)

The two types of PRO also differ in terms of whether they are lexically governed or not. Traditionally it has been claimed that PRO simply has to be ungoverned (Chomsky 1981). But it has recently been suggested that obligatorily controlled PRO is governed by a lexical head whereas arbitrary PRO is not (Hornstein and Lightfoot 1987). I will discuss the former case first. Consider the following sentence in which the matrix verb try allows only PRO as the subject of its complement.
(33) a. *He tried John to be punctual.
    b. He tried PRO to be punctual.

In its obligatory control use, PRO is considered to be an anaphoric nominal just like reflexive. Hence, its c-commanding antecedent has to occur within the same local domain, i.e. its governing category at S-structure$^2$.

(34) Governing category
    The governing category for X is the smallest S (=IP) or NP which contains X and its governor. (Chomsky 1981: 188)

In order for PRO in a lower clause to have a c-commanding antecedent, it must have a governor in a higher clause, for in S-structure the subject PRO is in the specifier of IP and therefore cannot be c-commanded by any other NP in its own clause. The following tree diagram helps illustrate how the obligatory controlled PRO is governed. (I assume with Hornstein and Lightfoot (1987) that try takes an IP complement.)
(35) He tried PRO to be punctual.

S-structure:

The verb *try* governs PRO in this structure since it c-commands it and there is no intervening barrier. (IP2 is not a barrier since it is a complement.) Hence, the governing category for PRO is IP1, which contains the required antecedent (*he*). Thus, it receives the correct anaphoric interpretation.

On the other hand, there are no such restrictions on arbitrary PRO, for in this use, PRO is not considered to be an anaphor, but rather a pronominal like *he*. As such, it must not have a c-commanding antecedent within its governing category. Hence, it can occur within a sentential subject, as in the following example.
(36) John believes [that [PRO to deceive someone] is disgusting].

S-structure:

In this sentence, PRO is not governed either by anything outside or inside its clause. (Following Haegeman (1991), I assume that to is not a governor.) Although the higher verb believe c-commands PRO, it does not govern it since IP3 is a barrier (not being a complement). Hence, the PRO in this sentence gets an arbitrary interpretation.
3.3 Passives in GB Theory

Having just sketched the basic points of the GB theory, I will now briefly discuss how the theory analyzes the English passive construction.

Pretheoretically, "prototypical" passives of transitive verbs can be characterized as differing from the corresponding actives in two respects (Perlmutter and Postal 1983).

(37) a. The subject is demoted to an oblique (or remains unexpressed).
   b. The object is promoted to subject.

Within the GB framework, the characteristics of passives are accounted for in terms of the following two crucial properties (Chomsky 1981, Jaeggli 1986, and Roeper 1987).

(i) The specifier of VP does not receive a theta-role.
(ii) The object NP does not receive Case within VP.

To understand how these properties are derived in GB theory, it is first necessary to consider the lexical properties of a typical transitive verb, such as *destroy*.

(38) *destroy* + [ _ NP], <Agent, Theme>

As (38) shows, *destroy* subcategorizes an NP as its direct object and determines two thematic roles—an agent and theme. It is assumed that the theme is ‘linked’ to the verb’s complement NP (or ‘internal
argument’), while the agent is associated with the subject or ‘external argument’. By convention, an underline is used to indicate the theta-role associated with the verb’s external argument in the lexical entry.

It is further assumed that the passive morpheme (in English, the -ed suffix) ‘delinks’ the theta-role which is associated with the subject of the base verb (the agent role in (38)), and that it cancels the verb’s ability to assign Objective Case to its object. The terms used for these two processes are ‘dethematization’ and ‘Case absorption’, respectively. These two processes are closely tied to each other, as suggested by Burzio (1986) in the first half of his well-known generalization concerning theta role assignment and case marking.

(39) Burzio’s generalization (1986)

If a verb does not theta-mark its subject, it cannot Case-mark its object.

Consider now the D-structure and S-structure for the active and passive sentences exemplified below.

(40) The gang destroyed the car
a. D-structure

[ ___ [VP the gang destroyed the car] ]

AG TH
b. S-structure

\[ \text{[[the gang]}_i \ [\text{VP} \ t_i \text{ destroyed the car }] ] \]

AG \hspace{3cm} TH

(41) The car was destroyed.

a. D-structure:

\[ [ \_ \text{ was } [\text{destroyed the car} ] ] \]

TH

b. S-structure:

\[ [\text{the car was } [\text{destroyed } t ] ] \]

TH

In the active sentence (40), the agent role is associated with the subject and the theme role with the direct object. As (41) shows, however, this does not happen in the passive structure, where dethematization has dissociated the external theta role from the subject position. Instead, this position is filled by the NP the car, which moves there from the D-structure object position in which it receives its theme role. This movement is obligatory in order to avoid a violation of the Case Filter. That is, since the passive verb loses the ability to assign Case (by Case absorption), the car in (41a) cannot stay in the object position without violating the Case Filter. If it moves to the subject position, on the other hand, it receives Nominative Case from the tensed Infl.
In this section, I have discussed how the standard GB theory analyzes passives. In the next section, I will introduce Roeper’s affixation theory, which focuses on the effect of affixation on the theta grid.

3.4 Roeper’s affixation theory

I will outline the three claims from Roeper’s (1987) theory of affixation which are crucial to my analysis. The first of these claims is that affixes may have their own thematic structure or ‘theta grid’. Based on this assumption, Roeper distinguishes three kinds of affixes:

a. Affixes that match the thematic roles on verbs (e.g. -ed, etc.)

b. Affixes that inherit the thematic roles on verbs (e.g. -ing, etc.)

c. Affixes that block the thematic roles on verbs (e.g. -ful, etc.)

(Since blocking affixes are not relevant to my analysis, they are not further discussed here.)

The difference between matching and inheriting affixes is that the former has a grid that includes its own theta roles, while the latter starts out with an empty grid. We can illustrate matching and inheriting affixes in more detail using -ed (the passive suffix) and -ing in English. According to Roeper, the passive suffix carries its own thematic grid: [Agent, Theme]. Because it is a matching affix, it can therefore be attached only to a verb which carries the same thematic grid, namely a transitive verb. Therefore, it is possible to form the
passive structure *(be) arrested*, since arrest has a matching grid: [Agent, Theme], but not *(be) arrived since arrive* has the thematic grid [Agent].

In contrast with -ed, the suffix -ing can be attached to both transitive and intransitive verbs. Hence, arresting and arriving are both possible. In order to capture this fact about -ing, Roeper assumes that -ing carries an empty thematic grid which then inherits the thematic role(s) of the base verb.

A second key claim of Roeper's approach that is also relevant to my analysis involves the notion of 'licensing'. Affixes that carry a thematic grid (matching and inheriting affixes) do not necessarily assign all their thematic roles to syntactic positions, but they do license syntactic positions for all thematic roles if the roles in the thematic grid are in a position to govern argument phrases.

(42) Licensing Condition

A theta role in the theta grid licenses an argument phrase in a position that it governs.

For instance, the thematic grid of the passive suffix in English licenses an agentive PP (a by-phrase), which may or may not be expressed overtly.

(43) The car was destroyed (by the gang).
Where the thematic role is not overtly expressed, it is called an 'implicit argument'. The following definition is based on Roeper's (1987) proposal:

(44) Implicit Argument

A thematic role in the thematic grid is an implicit argument iff it is in a structural position to license a phrase (i.e. XP, but no phrase occurs.

Although it is not encoded as an overt phrase, an implicit argument is still present and able to participate in interpretive processes such as control (see below).

A third claim of Roeper's analysis is that some affixes, e.g. the passive suffix -ed are phrasal. That is, they not only permit percolation of the thematic grid to the X node created by affixation but also allow percolation to the X' node. This property of phrasal affixes plays a crucial role in licensing of thematic PPs (such as the agentive phrase) and in the control of PRO in rationale clauses. To see this, consider first the representation of the verb phrase sunk by the man. The passive morpheme (a matching suffix) carries the grid [Agent, Theme], which matches the grid of the verb sink.
The passive suffix is phrasal and hence the matching grid percolates up to the V' level, from where it can license the sister phrase *by the man*.

Control of PRO in a rationale clause is also possible when the thematic grid containing the required agent role is in a position from which it can c-command PRO. In structure (46), for instance, the rationale clause is attached to the VP node. (Roeper does not adopt the VP-internal subject hypothesis. Here I follow his assumption, although the theory works equally well with a VP-internal subject.)
(46) The boat was sunk by the man [PRO to collect the insurance].

Since the PRO in this sentence is governed by the matrix V, it is anaphoric and therefore subject to obligatory control. The controller in this case is the agent argument the man in the matrix clause. Now, the overt agent NP the man does not itself c-command PRO, since the first XP above it (the PP node) does not dominate PRO. Crucially, however, the Agent role in the thematic grid does c-command PRO, because the first XP above it is VP, which dominates PRO. This also accounts for the fact that even when there is no by phrase the control relation holds in the passive.

(47) The boat was sunk [PRO to collect the insurance].

Now consider the gerundive noun phrase sinking of the ship. The crucial difference between -ing and -ed is that the former suffix carries an empty grid which subsequently inherits the thematic roles
of sink. Like -ed, the suffix -ing is phrasal so that its theta grid percolates up to the N' level, from where it can license the thematic PP of the ship.

(48)

Since the suffix -ing allows percolation to N', its grid is also in a position to c-command the PRO in a rationale clause that is attached to NP. Sentence (49) provides an example of this.

(49) The sinking of the ship [PRO to collect the insurance] was terrible.

In subsequent chapters, we will make use of a modified version of Roeper's affixation theory to help determine the properties of the Japanese passives, spontaneous, honorific, and potential constructions.
3.5. Summary

In this chapter, I have outlined the basic theoretical assumptions that I am adopting from the GB theory and Roeper's affixation theory.
Notes

1. This is also known as m-command.

2. This involves another subtheory of constraints, namely the binding theory. In GB, obligatorily controlled PRO is considered to be an anaphor. Hence, it has to be bound within its governing category, i.e., it must have a c-commanding antecedent within a particular local domain.
CHAPTER 4
Background for direct and indirect passives

4.1. Introduction

Passives are one of the most studied constructions in Japanese linguistics. In this chapter, I will briefly review the controversy over the analysis of the two types of passives found in Japanese.

4.2. Review of the controversy over the passive

As mentioned in the introduction, Japanese has two types of passives: direct and indirect. The former is roughly parallel to the English passive, and can be built only upon a transitive verb, while the latter has no analog in English and can be built upon an intransitive verb as well as a transitive verb (see Table 2.1 in chapter 2).

(1) Base verb = taihos- 'to arrest' <AG, TH>
   a. Active
      Keisatu ga Taroo o taihosi-ta
      Police Nm Taroo Ac arrest-Pst
      'The police arrested Taroo.'
   b. Direct passive
      Taroo ga keisatu ni taihos-are-ta
      Taroo Nm police obl arrest-RARE-Pst
      'Taroo was arrested by the police.'
(2) Base Verb: *nak- 'to cry' < AG >

a. Active
Taroo ga nai-ta.
Taroo Nm cry-pst
'Taroo cried'

b. Indirect passive
Tanaka-san ga Taroo ni nak-are-ta.
Tanaka-Mr. Nm Taroo Obl cry-RARE-Pst
'Mr.Tanaka was cried on by Taroo.'

A clear difference between these two passives is that in direct passives the number of arguments for the base verb remains the same, whereas in indirect passives it changes, i.e., one extra argument (the experiencer argument) is added. Thus, in (1b), the two arguments of the base verb *taihos- 'to arrest' are maintained while in (2b) the experiencer noun phrase *Tanaka-san ‘Mr. Tanaka’ appears in addition to the agent argument of the base verb *nak- ‘to cry’.

The question of whether the direct and the indirect passives should be viewed as two independent constructions has been the source of major controversy in the study of the Japanese passive. In the transformational tradition, for instance, there are two opposing positions: the "non-uniform" theory and the "uniform" theory. The former, e.g. Kuno (1973),\(^1\) analyzes the direct passive as monoclausal and the indirect passive as biclausal at the underlying level, whereas the latter, e.g. Howard and Niekawa-Howard (1976), derives both types from a biclausal source.
The controversy has involved various syntactic and semantic arguments which are mostly based on the interaction of passivization with other processes. The non-uniform theories use these facts to argue for the presence of unique properties in each passive structure while the uniform theories seek to show that none of this data distinguishes one passive from the other.

In current work, the question of whether one should postulate one -(r)are or two (i.e. to pursue a uniform or non-uniform approach) seems to be reduced to the question of how one should view and analyze the fact that an extra argument is present only in indirect passives, as illustrated by the examples in (2). Whereas the nonuniform approach views the presence of an extra noun phrase in only one type of passive as an indication that there are two separate patterns (Inoue, 1989), the uniform approach disputes this conclusion. (Kuno 1983, Miyagawa 1989, etc).

What makes this controversy more complicated is that those who (claim to) take a uniform approach are divided into two subcamps. One believes that there is only one -(r)are in the lexicon and no structural difference between the two passives (e.g. Kuno 1983). In contrast, the other group maintains the idea that there is only one passive suffix, but that it has different properties which are manifested in the two different structures. Sugioka (1984), for instance, claims that the passive suffix has two different scopes: one manifested in the direct passive, and the other in the indirect passive. (See section 4.3.)
Although there is still disagreement over whether to postulate one or two -(r)ares, researchers seem to agree that the theta role assigned to the extra NP in the indirect passive is that of experiencer, and that this role is added by the passive suffix. This latter conclusion is drawn from the fact that the experiencer argument simply does not have a corresponding argument in the active sentence, where the passive suffix does not appear. Hence, the subject Tanaka-san ‘Mr.Tanaka’ in (2b), repeated below, cannot be realized in the active sentence. Thus, (2b’) is unacceptable.

(2b) **Indirect passive**
Tanaka-san ga Taroo ni nak-are-ta.
Tanaka-Mr. Nm Taroo Obl cry-RARE-Pst
‘Mr.Tanaka was cried on by Taroo.’

(2b’) **Active sentence with an experiencer argument**
* Taroo ga Tanaka-san ni/(o) nai-ta.
  Taroo Nm Tanaka-Mr. Dat/Ac cry-Pst
  ‘Taroo cried on Mr.Tanaka.’

Hence, they conclude that the experiencer NP cannot be an argument of the base verb, and that it must be licensed by the passive suffix.

Here, I pursue the lexical approach to the passive with the goal of reaching a uniform analysis of the direct and indirect passives in which there is one -(r)are with a single set of lexical properties. Hence, I will be arguing that there is no structural difference between the two passives. Moreover, contrary to the current assumption that the experiencer role in indirect passives is assigned
by the suffix, I will take the position that it is the base verb that licenses this argument.

In the next section, the arguments given in the literature that purport to establish different properties for the two passives will be critically examined.

4.3 Arguments given for the difference

The literature on Japanese syntax contains various arguments that claim to show that direct and indirect passives have different properties. In this section three of these arguments will be examined, and I will argue that none of them supports the claim.

I will start with the argument involving the interpretation of reflexive pronouns. In Japanese, the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun *zibun* 'self' is said to be the subject (see Kuno 1973). Hence, the interpretation of *zibun* has often been used as a test for subjecthood.

(3) a. Taroo* o ga* Hanako* ni zibun*/j no hon o ut-ta.
   Taroo Nm Hanako Dat self Pos book Ac sell-Pst
   'Taroo sold selfr’s book to Hanako.'

b. Taroo* o ga Ziroo* o zibun*/j no kasa de nagut-ta.
   Taroo Nm Ziroo Ac self Pos umbrella with hit-Pst
   'Taroo hit Ziroo with selfi’s umbrella.'

In (3a) *zibun* 'self' can be coreferential with the subject *Taroo*, but not with the indirect object *Hanako*. Similarly, in (3b), the antecedent of the reflexive is *Taroo*, the subject, but not *Ziroo*, the direct object.
However, it has been noted that the reflexives in indirect passives can be ambiguous in that both the surface subject and demoted 'logical' subject can be antecedent of the reflexive. In contrast the direct passive permits no such ambiguity.

(4) **Direct Passive**

\[
\text{Taroo}_i \text{ ga } \text{Ziroo}_j \text{ ni } \text{zibun}_i/^*/_j \text{ no heya de nagur-are-ta.}
\]

\[
\text{Taroo Nm Ziroo by self pos room at hit-RARE-Pst}
\]

'Taroo was hit by Ziroo in self's room.'

(5) **Indirect Passive**

\[
\text{Taroo}_i \text{ ga } \text{Ziroo}_j \text{ ni } \text{zibun}_i/^*/_j \text{ no uti ni ik-are-ta.}
\]

\[
\text{Taroo Nm Ziroo by self pos house to go-RARE-Pst.}
\]

'Taroo was affected by Ziroo's going to self's house.'

In example (4), *zibun* 'self' can be coreferential only with the surface subject, *Taroo*, but not with the demoted logical subject, *Ziroo*. On the other hand, in (5), it can be coreferential with either *Taroo* or *Ziroo*.

This fact has been used to support the claim that the two passives are derived from different sources. For instance, in traditional transformational grammar, those who advocate the non-uniform theory have claimed that the difference in the interpretation of *zibun* 'self' is due to the fact that the indirect passive is derived from a biclausal source (i.e., it has two subjects each of which can be the antecedent of reflexive), while the direct passive consists of a single clause.

However, this conclusion is undermined by the fact that there are quite a few examples of direct passives in which the reflexive can have more than one antecedent.
(6) **Ambiguity of zibun in direct passive**

Taroo ga Ziroo ni zibuni/j no heya de mat-are-ta.
Taroo Nm Ziroo by self pos room at wait-RARE-Pst
'Taroo was waited for by Ziroo in self's room.'

In sentence (6) above, *zibun* 'self' can be coreferential with either *Taroo* or *Ziroo*, although it is derived from a monoclausal source in the non-uniform theory, and there is therefore only one subject.

What this indicates is that the sources for direct and indirect passives are not necessarily different, and that whatever the reason for the ambiguity in the interpretation of *zibun*, it is not necessarily due to structural differences between the two passives.

As a matter of fact, it has been questioned whether *zibun* interpretation exclusively identifies the subject. Indeed, quite a few counter-examples have been found for the generalization that the antecedent of the reflexives is the subject (McCawley 1976, Kitagawa, 1981). For instance, there are sentences with a simple verb in which the reflexive can be coreferential either with the subject or with object.

(7) **Ambiguity of zibun in a monoclausal sentence**

a. Watakusij wa kodomoj o zibuni/j no heya de nekasi-ta.
I Top child Ac self Pos room in sleep-Pst
'I let the child sleep in self's room.'
b Senseeı wa gakseej ni zibuni/j no seki-bangoo o
Teacher Top student Dat self pos seat-number Ac

osie-ta.
teach-Pst

'The teacher let the student know self's seat number.'

Though *nekas*- ‘to let someone sleep’ and *osie*- ‘to let someone know’ have a causative meaning, they are morphologically simple transitive verbs. Hence, the object/indirect object should not be able to serve as antecedent for the reflexive, but it can--creating ambiguity in the interpretation of *zibun* in these sentences.

The second argument that I will discuss involves the semantic function of the passive suffix. It has been claimed that *(r)are* in indirect passives exhibits an adversity meaning while the corresponding suffix in the direct passive does not. For instance, sentence (8), an indirect passive, means that the wife’s death affected Mr. Tanaka adversely, not positively.

(8) **Indirect passive with adversity meaning**

Tanaka-san wa okusan ni sin-are-ta.
Tanaka-Mr Top wife by die-RARE-Pst.
'Mr. Tanaka’s wife died on him.'

Hence, an odd sentence results if one replaces *sin*— ‘to die’ with a predicate like *yoku nar*— ‘to get better’ which denotes a positive action or event.
This is because someone’s recovery is normally interpreted only as a positive outcome, and it clashes with the adversity meaning that the indirect passive supposedly gives. Of course, this same sentence is perfectly acceptable if it is uttered in a situation where Mr.Tanaka was affected negatively by his wife’s recovery (e.g., he wanted his wife to die so he could collect the insurance money).

On the other hand, with direct passives, we normally don’t get an adversity meaning (though it is possible, as I will show below).

(10) **Direct passive**

Kodomo ga hitori sensei ni sik-are-te i-ta.

‘A child was being scolded by the teacher.’

Hence, (10) simply describes the event from the child’s point of view, without any adversity meaning.

It is also possible in direct passives for -(r)are to occur with a verb that has a positive connotation, as (11) indicates. (Recall that this combination often yields oddness in the indirect passive.)

(11) Taroo ga sensei ni home-rare-ta.

‘Taroo was praised by the teacher.’
The conclusion that has been drawn from examples like these is that -(r)are in direct passives has no semantic content whereas the homophonous affix in indirect passives has an adversative meaning. Hence, it is concluded, they must be different suffixes.

However, this cannot be correct, for there are a number of direct passive sentences which clearly exhibit an adversative meaning. (See Howard & Niyekawa-Howard (1976) for details.)

(12) Direct Passive with adversity meaning
Sono kenkyuzyo ga Satoo-san ni yame-rare-ta.
that research center Nm Satoo-Mr. by quit-Pst.
'The research center was left by Mr. Satoo.'

At the same time, there are indirect passives which do not have any adversive meaning at all.

(13) Indirect Passive without adverse meaning
a. Kanzya ga ude o syoodokus-arete i-ta.
injured person Nm arm Ac disinfected-RARE-Prg-Pst
'A patient’s arm was being disinfected.'

b. Taroo ga sibaraku soyokaze ni huk-arete i-ta.
Taroo Nm while soft wind obl blow-RARE-Prg-Pst.
'Taroo was feeling soft wind blowing for a while.'

Hence, the presence of adversive meaning cannot be used as an argument for two separate passive constructions since it is not a unique property of the indirect passive. As Kuno (1983) notes, whether the passive is direct or indirect is not same thing as "plain"
or "adversive". Hence, the direct passive can be either plain or adversive as can the indirect passive.

The final argument that I will consider here involves the scope of aspectual verbs in passive sentences. Sugioka (1984: 220-228) claims that the passive morpheme can attach either to \( V' \) (=V and its internal argument) or to \( V'' \). If it attaches to \( V' \), the result is a direct passive, but if it attaches to the \( V'' \), the result is an indirect passive. (Since Sugioka does not discuss the source of the extra NP in indirect passive, I do not know how she assumes it is licensed.)

Sugioka exploits the passivization of verbs with aspectual morphemes to show that the passive morpheme can attach to either \( V' \) or \( V'' \). Take, for instance, the progressive marker \(-te\ i-ru\), which turns an action verb into the progressive form

\[
\text{(14) Taroo ga hon o yonde i-ru} \\
\text{Taroo Nm book Ac read-Prog.} \\
\text{‘Taroo is reading a book.’}
\]

Interestingly, the passive suffix can precede or follow the progressive marker. However, Sugioka claims that the order of these two elements is not free, but rather is determined by whether the elements are in a direct or indirect passive sentence. She gives the following examples to support her claim.

\[
\text{(15) Active} \\
\text{Taroo wa Hanako o mitume-te i-ta. (Sugioka’s (79a))} \\
\text{Taroo Top Hanako Ac stare-Prg-Pst} \\
\text{‘Taroo was staring at Hanako.’}
\]
(16) **Direct Passive** (Sugioka's (79b) and (79c))

a. RARE followed by a progressive marker

Hanako wa Taroo ni mitume-rare-te i-ta.
Hanako Top Taroo Obl stare-RARE-Prg-Pst
Hanako was being stared at by Taroo.

b. A progressive marker followed by RARE

?Hanako wa mitume-te i-rare-ta. (Sugioka's judgement is *)
Hanako Top stare-Prg-RARE-Pst

The examples in (16) seem to indicate that -(r)are in the direct passive has to precede the progressive marker. Sugioka compares these results with those of indirect passives.

(17) **Active Sentence**

Hanako ga yodoosi okite i-ta.
Hanako Nm all night get up-Prg-Pst.
Hanako stayed up all night.

(18) **Indirect Passive**

a. RARE followed by a progressive marker

*Taroo wa Hanako ni yodoosi oki-rare-te i-ta.
Taroo Top Hanako obl all night get up-RARE-Prg-Pst

b. A progressive marker followed by RARE (Sugioka's (81))

Taroo wa Hanako ni yodoosi okite i-rare-ta.
Taroo Top Hanako obl all night get up-Prg-RARE-Pst
Taroo had Hanako stay up all night on him.

As one can see, in the indirect passive it seems that the suffix has to follow the progressive marker, which is the opposite of the order in the direct passive.
Sugioka tries to explain this contrast by claiming that the difference in acceptability between the sentences in (16) and (18) follows if we assume that the aspectual markers combine with $V'$ to form $V''$ and that the scope of -(r)are is $V'$ in direct passives, but $V''$ in indirect passives. Consider the following two orders of the suffix and the progressive marker for the direct passive: (See examples in (16) above.)

(19) **Direct Passive:** the scope of -(r)are is $V'$

a. \[ [ V ]v'-(r)are ]v' \\
\[ [ V ]v'-(r)arete ]v' + i (-ru) ] v''

b. \[ V-te i ]v'' \\
*[ [ V-te i ]v'' + -rare (-ru)] ]

For direct passives, the progressive marker can only follow the passive suffix, for when the suffix is attached to a verb, it forms a $V'$ to which the progressive marker may be attached to form a $V''$. On the other hand, if the progressive marker is attached to the verb first, as (19b) illustrates, it forms a $V''$ to which direct passive -(r)are cannot be attached since $V''$ is beyond its scope. Thus, the order in (19a) is possible, but the one in (19b) is impossible.

Keeping these results in mind, now compare them with those of indirect passive. The -(r)are suffix in indirect passives has the scope of $V''$, not $V'$. (See examples in (18).)
(20) **Indirect Passive:** the scope of -(r)are is V''

a. \[ V-(r)rete \ ] V''

[*\[ V-(r)rete \ ] V'' + i (-ru) ]V''

b. \[ [V-te]v' i ] V''

[ [ [V-te]v' i ] V'' + -rare (-ru) ]V''

As one can see, the results for indirect passives are the reverse of those for direct passives in that the progressive marker has to precede the passive suffix. According to Sugioka's assumption, the progressive marker is attached to V' and therefore cannot be preceded by -(r)are which has V'' scope. Thus, the order in (20b) is possible, but the one in (20a) is impossible. Sugioka maintains that there is only one lexical entry for -(r)are, but believes that two variants of the affix differ in their scopes.

Sugioka's claim, however, cannot be correct. I will show that the difference in acceptability between the sentences in (16) and (18) above is based on semantics.

First, compare the direct passive sentence in (21) with (16), particularly with (16b), repeated below for convenience.

(21) **A progressive marker followed by RARE in the direct passive**

Hanako wa Taroo ni itu-made-mo mitume-te i-rare-ta.
Hanako Top Taroo Obl long time stare-at-Prg-RARE-Pst
‘Hanako was stared at by Taroo for a long time.’
(16) **Direct Passive** (Sugioka's (79b) and (79c))

a. **RARE followed by a progressive marker**
   
   Hanako wa Taroo ni mitume-rare-te i-ta.
   
   Hanako Top Taroo Obl stare-RARE-Prg-Pst
   
   'Hanako was being watched by Taroo.'

b. **A progressive marker followed by RARE**
   
   ?Hanako wa mitume-te i-rare-ta. (Sugioka's judgement is *)
   
   Hanako Top stare-Prg-RARE-Pst

Notice that the only difference between (16b) and (21) is that the latter has an adverbial phrase; in every other respect, the two sentences are the same. If the reason for the unacceptability of (16b), which I don't find that bad, is that the suffix has to precede the progressive marker, as Sugioka claims, then why is (21) acceptable? I don't believe that those two elements have a fixed order, though each order gives a slightly different meaning. Let us compare (21) with (16a).

In (16a), the passive suffix precedes the progressive marker, and the domain of the progressive marker is the whole event of Hanako being watched by Taroo. Hence, the whole predicate gives the meaning of being watched. In (21) above, on the other hand, the order of the two is reversed. The domain of the progressive marker is now inside that of the passive suffix. We have an event in which Taroo has been watching Hanako for a long time, and the scene is described from Hanako's point of view. Hence, one gets the meaning that Hanako was affected by the event of Taroo's staring at her for a long time.
With indirect passives we obtain the same results as direct passives, i.e., the order of the progressive marker and -(r)are is free. Examine the following examples which illustrate even more strongly that Sugioka’s claim is wrong.

(22) Indirect Passive

a. Progressive marker + RARE

Taroo ga kodomo ni sanzikan zutto soba de
Taroo Nm child obl three-hours continuously nearby

nai-te i-rare-ta.
cry-Prg-RARE-Pst

'The child cried on Taroo nearby for three hours continuously.'

b. RARE + Progressive marker

Taroo ga hazimete no ko ni dak-u tabi-ni
Taroo Nm first Pos child obl hold-Pre times

nak-are-te-i-ta
cry-RARE-Prg-Pst

'Taroo’s first child cried on him every time he held her.'

Both (22a) and (22b) are indirect passives built on the intransitive verb *nak-* ‘to cry.’ In (a) the progressive marker precedes the passive suffix, whereas in (b) it follows the suffix -(r)are. If Sugioka’s analysis is correct, (b) should be unacceptable, but it is in fact acceptable.

The relative scope of the passive suffix and the progressive marker differ in these two sentences. In each case, the affix on the right has broader scope than the affix that precedes it. For (a), one
imagines a scene in which the child had been crying for three hours, and Taroo, the father, was affected by it. By contrast, for (b), one imagines a scene in which Taroo’s first child cries every time he picks her up, and that this situation continued.

Before concluding this section, I would like to comment on the reason why the indirect passive sentence in (18a) is unacceptable, repeated below for convenience.

(18) Indirect Passive
   a. RARE followed by a progressive marker
   *Taroo wa Hanako ni yodoosi oki-rare-te i-ta.
      Taroo Top Hanako obl all night get up-RARE-Prg-Pst

_Oki_- is the base verb which simply means ‘to get up or wake up’. It gives the meaning of staying up only when it is combined with the progressive marker. By having the adverb _yodoosi_ ‘all night’, it becomes impossible for _oki_- to have the meaning of ‘to get/wake up’. In fact, the passive without the progressive marker is also unacceptable here, as (23) shows.

(23) *Taroo wa Hanako ni yoodoosi oki-rare-ta.
    Taroo Top Hanako obl all night get up-RARE-Pst

But when an adverb like _itizikan-oki ni_ ‘at every one hour’ is used in the place of _yodoosi_ ‘all night’, the sentence becomes acceptable.
(23') Taroo wa kodomo ni itizikanoki ni okirare-ta.
Taroo Top child Obl one-hour-every at wake up-RARE-Pst
Taroo was affected by the child's waking up every hour.'

Interestingly and expectedly, the progressive marker can be
attached to the sentence without making it unacceptable.

(23") Taroo wa kodomo ni itizikanoki ni okirare-te i-ru.
Taroo Top child Obl one hour-every at wake up-RARE-Pst
'Taroo has been affected by the child's waking up every hour

Therefore, there is no scope difference between the -(r)are used for
the direct passive and the one used for the indirect passive.

4.4 Summary

In summary, we have considered three arguments for the
claim that direct and indirect passives are distinct: the
interpretation of reflexives, the semantics of -(r)are, and the domains
of the passive suffix. However, as we have shown, these arguments
fail to support the proposed distinction. Rather the results seem to
suggest that the two passives may be instances of the same
construction. This seems to be the case for every argument given in
support of non-uniform theories, not just the sample arguments that
I have discussed. As far as I know, there is no clear difference
(other than the presence of the extra argument in the indirect
passive) to distinguish between the two types of passive posited for
Japanese. I will return to the question of where this extra argument
originates in chapter 6. In the meantime, however, I will propose a uniform analysis for the Japanese passive, beginning with the so-called direct passive construction.
Notes

1. Kuno (1983) rejects his previous non-uniform theory and proposes a uniform theory.

2. It has been pointed out by John Haig that for some Japanese speakers *zibun* 'self' in (7a) is not ambiguous.

3. *-te i-ru* does not give the meaning of ongoing action with all verbs.
CHAPTER 5
The direct passive

5.1 Introduction to direct passive

In this chapter, I will examine the direct passive construction of modern Japanese and propose an analysis for it. In later chapters, I will try to relate this analysis with the properties of other patterns containing p-suffixes.

The direct passive in Japanese is very similar to the English passive. In both patterns, the passive morpheme attaches to a transitive verb and the logical object of the verb becomes the subject, as the following examples illustrate.

(1) a. Taroo ga Ziroo o korosi-ta.
   Taroo Nm Ziroo Ac kill-Pst
   ‘Taroo killed Ziroo.’

   b. Ziroo ga Taroo ni koros-are-ta.
   Ziroo Nm Taroo Obl kill-RARE-Pst
   ‘Ziroo was killed by Taroo.’

As is the case with the English passives, the ‘demoted’ logical subject need not be realized in Japanese, as (2) illustrates.

(2) Ziroo ga koros-are-ta.
   Ziroo Nm kill-RARE-Pst
   ‘Ziroo was murdered.’

The Japanese passive differs from its English counterpart in allowing either the indirect object or the direct object to become the
subject. I will call the former the *secondary passive*, and the latter the *primary passive* for convenience and to avoid confusion.

(3) English Examples
a. Active sentence
Mary gave the prize to John

b. Primary Passive
The prize was given to John.

c. Secondary Passive
*John was given the prize to.

(4) Japanese Examples
(Note that the dative case particle and the oblique particle are homophonous.)

a. Active sentence
Mary ga John ni syoo o atae-ta.
Mary Nm John Dat prize Ac give-Pst
‘Mary gave the prize to John.’

b. Primary Passive
Syoo ga John ni atae-rare-ta.
prize Nm John Obl give-RARE-Pst
‘The prize was given to John.

c. Secondary Passive
John ga syoo o atae-rare-ta.
John Nm prize Ac give-RARE-Pst
‘John was given the prize.’
Thus, (4c) is acceptable, but its English counterpart in (3c) is not. We will discuss this difference in the latter part of this section.

First, however, let us go back to examples (1) and (2) above. Of interest to us here is the following question: do the verbs in (1b) and (2) have the same argument structure even though the former has two overt arguments while the latter has only one? The answer is yes. I will show that although the demoted agent in direct passives need not be lexically realized, it is nonetheless maintained along with the theme argument, and that the verb behaves like a two-place predicate.

The argument for thematic transitivity in agentless passives involves rationale clauses. In rationale clauses the only NP which is not lexically realized is the subject. Hence, I am differentiating rationale clauses from purpose clauses, in which non-subject arguments can be missing, too. Compare the following two sentences:

(5) a. **Rationale clause (missing subject argument only)**

\[ \text{PRO sono hon o yom-u tame ni} \] tossyokan ni
\[ \text{that book Ac read-Pre in-order-to library to} \]

\[ \text{it-ta.} \]
\[ \text{go-Pst} \]

'I went to the library to read the book.'

b. **Purpose clause (missing subject and direct object arguments)**

\[ \text{PRO _ tanosim-u tame ni} \] sono hon o kat-ta.
\[ \text{enjoy-Pre in-order-to that book Ac buy-Pst} \]

'I bought the book to enjoy.'
As (6) and (7) below show, a rationale clause can cooccur only with a matrix sentence that contains an agentive NP. (I assume that *hasir- ‘to run’ has the thematic structure [Agent] and *oti- ‘to fall’ the thematic structure [Theme].)

(6) Matrix sentence with agentive NP

[PRO \ kenkoo o tamot-u tame ni] Taroo gai mainiti health Ac keep-Pre in-order-to Taroo Nm every day

hasir-u.
run-Pre

‘Taroo runs every day to keep his good health.’

(7) Matrix sentence without agentive NP

*[PRO \ hokenkin o tor-u tame ni ] Taroo gai
insurance Ac take-Pre in-order-to Taroo Nm

(ayamatte) gake kara oti-ta.
(accidentally) cliff from fall-Pst

‘Taroo fell from the cliff (accidentally) to collect the insurance.’

The verbs in (6) and (7) are both intransitive, but the former assigns an Agentive role to its subject while the latter assigns a Theme role. As these sentences indicate, the Agent can control PRO in a rationale clause, whereas the Theme cannot.

Now consider the following sentences:
(8) a. Agentless passive with a rationale clause

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{uti ga} & \quad [\text{PRO hokenkin o tor-u tame ni}] \\
\text{house Nm} & \quad \text{insurance Ac take-Pre in-order-to}
\end{align*}
\]

yak-are-ta.

burn-RARE-Pst.

'The house was burnt to collect the insurance.'

b. Passive with demoted agent with a rationale clause

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{uti ga} & \quad [\text{PROi hokenkin o tor-u tame ni}] \\
\text{house Nm} & \quad \text{insurance Ac collect in-order-to}
\end{align*}
\]

yanusii. ni yak-are-ta.

landlord obl burn-RARE-Pst

'The house was burnt by the landlord to collect the insurance.'

Note that these sentences are acceptable even when there is no overt agentive phrase. Given that the interpretation of rationale clauses requires an agent argument, and that this (obligatorily controlled) PRO requires the presence of a c-commanding antecedent, we must thus conclude that an argument of this sort is somehow present but invisible. Recall that such an element is called an implicit argument as discussed in chapter 3. I will discuss the manner in which this fact should be represented in section 5.3.

5.2 Movement or Externalization

Since the passive may be the most studied construction in Japanese, it is not surprising that various kinds of analyses have been put forward for it. Of these, there have been basically two views in
the literature which presuppose (as I do) that affixation takes place in the lexicon. These views differ in terms of how to "derive" the surface subject from the logical object. The first (e.g., Kitagawa, 1986) is lexicalist in that both the affixation and the mapping of arguments onto surface grammatical relations are determined before lexical insertion. Thus, according to this view, the logical object in the passive is 'externalized' in the lexicon and mapped directly onto the subject position at the time of lexical insertion.

The other view (e.g. Miyagawa, 1989) makes use of a movement analysis, which regards the subject of the passive as having moved to that position from the object position. For theory-internal as well as theory-external reasons, my analysis follows this second view (although I assume, of course, that affixation of -(r)are takes place in the lexicon).

I will start with the theory-internal reason. It is assumed in GB theory that each argument is associated with a specific syntactic position depending on its thematic role. For instance, the theme argument which appears in the subject position in the direct passive is associated with the sister position of V in D-structure. I will repeat in (9) the theta role assignment convention for the theme role introduced in section 3.2.2.

(9) • V assigns its theme role to an argument in complement position.
By the convention, the verb *koros-* ‘to kill’, for example, assigns a theme role to its sister in both the active and the passive.

(10)

**Active**

```
VP
  \[
  V' \quad \text{V} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{[TH]}
  \]
  \[
  \quad \text{koros-u}
  \]
```

**Passive**

```
VP
  \[
  V' \quad \text{V} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{[TH]}
  \]
  \[
  \quad \text{koros-are-ru}
  \]
```

Although the theme argument appears as the surface subject in the passive sentence, it must originate as sister of the V since this is the position to which the theme role is assigned. There is evidence from quantifier “floating” that the theme argument does not remain as the sister of V, and that it moves to the specifier of IP. When Japanese specifies the number of items to which an NP refers, it uses numeral quantifiers consisting of a numeral and a classifier which indicates the type of entity being counted. For instance, all of the following quantifiers mean three of something.

(11) a. san-nin ‘three (people)’
    b. san-satu ‘three (bound objects)’
    c. san-bon ‘three (long, cylindrical objects)’
But they are not in free variation since *san-nin*, for instance, is never used to count anything other than people.

One of the positions in which these quantifiers can occur is adjacent to the noun phrase with which they are associated (i.e. the NP whose referents are counted.)

(12) a. Tomodati ga san-nin hon o kat-ta.
friend Nm three book Ac buy-Pst
'Three of (my) friends bought books.'

b. Tomodati ga hon o san-satu kat-ta.
Friend Nm book Ac three buy-Pst
'(My) friend bought three books.'

It has been noted however that a noun phrase and the associated quantifier can be separated from each other by an intervening phrase. In a sentence with a transitive verb, for instance, the object noun phrase and the associated quantifier can be separated by the subject NP. Interestingly, however, the subject NP and its associated quantifier cannot be separated by the object.

(13) a. Object NP separates the subject and its associated quantifier
*Tomodati ga hon o san-nin kat-ta.
Friend Nm book Ac three buy-Pst
'Three of (my) friends bought books.'

b. Subject NP separates the object and its associated quantifier
Hon o tomodati ga san-satu kat-ta.
book Ac friend Nm three buy-Pst
'(My) friend bought three books.'
Saito (1985) takes adjacency to be the condition for the interpretation of the quantifier.

(14) Condition on floated quantifiers

Either the NP itself or its trace must be adjacent to the quantifier.

Saito (1985) then explains this asymmetry between (13a) and (13b) by assuming that the object NP has been preposed and left a trace which is still adjacent to the quantifier. The following is the structure for (13b) above. (Following Saito, I assume that a scrambled NP adjoins to IP (=S).

(15)

```
     IP
    /\  
   /  \ 
  NP_i IP NP_j
     /\     /
    /  \   /  
   hon NP_j tomodati IP
   /\     /
  /  \   /  
 t_j NP VP
   /\   /\ 
  /  \ /  \ 
 sansatu kat-ta NP QP V
```

Compare this with (13a) in which the object NP intervenes between the subject and its associated quantifier.
In this structure, neither tomodati 'friend' nor its trace is adjacent to sannin 'three people'. Hence, this argument cannot be associated with the quantifier.

It has also been observed that the surface subject of the direct passive does not behave like the subject of a transitive verb with regards to the position of the quantifier, since the two can be separated by another argument—the "demoted" logical subject.

(17) a. The subject NP and its associated quantifier in the passive
   Tomodati ga san-nin Taroo ni nagur-are-ta.
   friend Nm three Taroo Obl hit-RARE-Pst
   'Three of (my) friends were hit by Taroo.'

   b. The logical subject intervenes between the subject and its associated quantifier in the passive.
   Tomodati ga Taroo ni san-nin nagur-are-ta.
   friend Nm Taroo Obl three hit-RARE-Pst
   'Three of (my) friends were hit by Taroo.'
The same reasoning applied by Saito to the scrambling structure can be applied to the subject in the passive construction, as suggested by Miyagawa (1989). That is, if the surface subject of the direct passive has moved from the sister position of V, the acceptability of (17b) is expected. The following tree diagrams will help illustrate this.

(18) D-Structure for (17a) and (17b)
Tomodati is assigned the theme role as sister of V. In (17a), *tomodati* moves from this position to the subject position along with the quantifier, while in (17b), only *tomodati* moves. The trace left behind by this movement then satisfies the adjacency condition.³

On the other hand, the quantifier "floating" facts could be problematic for the lexical externalization approach since both the subject of a transitive and the subject of the passive are the external argument in deep structure and no trace is available to satisfy the adjacency requirement⁴. Compare the following sentences.

(19) **Passive sentence**

*Tomodati* ga kurasumeeto ni sannin nagur-are-ta  
friend Nm classmate Obl three hit-RARE-Pst  
'Three of my friends were hit by the classmate.'
(20) **Active sentence with a transitive verb**

Tomodati ga kurasumeeto o san-nin nagut-ta.
friend Nm classmate Ac three hit-Pst

'My friend hit three classmates.'
*‘Three of my friends hit a classmate.'

In (19) `san-nin` ‘three persons’ can be associated only with the subject `tomodati` ‘friends’. On the other hand, in (20) `san-nin` ‘three persons’ can be associated with the object `kurasumeeto` ‘classmates,’ but not with the subject `tomodati` ‘friends.’ In the lexical externalization approach it would be very difficult to explain why the subject can be associated with the quantifier in (19), but not in (20). The following tree diagrams help illustrate this problem.

(21) **D- and S-structure of (19)**

```
(19)
IP
  |NP
  |tomodati
  |VP
  |Pst
  |V'
  |QP
  |V'
  |kurasumeeto
  |ni
  |san-nin
  |nagur-are-ta.
```
(22) D- and S-structure of (20)

```
IP
  NP tomodati
   VP
    V
       NP QP V
     kurasumeeto san-nin nagut-ta.
```

Proponents of the lexical approach can use neither the grammatical function of the arguments nor the c-command relation to state the condition since in both (21) and (22) *tomodati* 'friends' is the subject and also c-commands the quantifier. Nor could they say that the quantifier is associated with the closest NP since the object NP may be preposed before the subject by scrambling, but can still be associated with the quantifier (see example (13b) above).

To summarize, I have argued here for the movement approach to direct passives using a theory-internal argument (the manner of theta assignment in GB) and a theory-external argument (the syntax of quantifier-NP relations in Japanese). In the next section, I will determine what kind of suffix -(r)are in direct passives is.

5.3 Analysis and representation of the direct passive

I will take the position that -(r)are is an inheriting suffix in Japanese direct passives. To see this, consider the following
sentences, each of which contains an external argument with a
different thematic role.

(23) **Active sentences**

a. **External argument = Agent**

Hanako ga Taroo o hatai-ta.
Hanako Nm Taroo Ac hit-Pst
‘Hanako hit Taroo.’

b. **Ext. argument = Source**

Taroo ga Hanako ni tegami o okut-ta.
Taroo Nm Hanako Dat letter Ac send-Pst.
‘Taroo sent a letter to Hanako.’

c. **Ext. argument = Instrument**

Hei ga uti zentai o kakon-de i-ru.
house Nm fence whole Ac surround-Prg-Pre.
‘A fence surrounds the whole house.’

(24) **Passive sentences**

a. **Agent**

Taroo ga Hanako ni hatak-are-ta.
Taroo Nm Hanako Obl hit-RARE-Pst
‘Taroo was hit by Hanako.’

b. **Source**

Sono tegami ga Taroo kara Hanako ni okur-are-ta.
that letter Nm Taroo from Hanako Dat send-RARE-Pst
‘The letter was sent from Taroo to Mary.’

c. **Instrument**

Uti ga hei de kakom-are-te i-ru.
house Nm fence with surround-RARE-Prg-Pre
‘The house is surrounded by a fence.’
The sentences in (23) are active structures while those in (45) are their passive counterparts. The theta roles of the subjects in (23a), (23b), and (23c) are the same as those of the ‘demoted’ noun phrase in (24a), (24b), and (24c), respectively. If the -(r)are were a matching suffix, then it would have to be associated with a variety of thematic grids. In order to form the passive verb hatak-are ‘to be hit’ in (24a), for example, the suffix would have to have the grid [Agent, Theme], while in order to form the passive verb kakom-are ‘to be surrounded’ in (24c), the suffix would need the grid [Instrument, Theme]. Hence, it cannot be a matching suffix, i.e., it has to have the same thematic roles in the grid as the base verbs. On the other hand, if we assume that -(r)are is an inheriting affix, then matters seem to be very simple. That is, the suffix simply inherits the thematic roles in the grid of the base verb, which explains why -(r)are can occur with verbs with different thematic grids.

A second reason for treating the direct passive suffix as inheriting is that it can attach to various verbs other than transitives.

(25) Verb with [Agent, Goal] thematic structure

a. Jiroo ga Hanako ni soodansi-ta
   Jiroo Nm Hanako Obl consult-Pst
   ‘Jiroo consulted with Hanako.’

b. Hanako ga Jiroo ni soodans-are-ta.
   Hanako Nm Jiroo Obl consult-RARE-Pst
   ‘Hanako was consulted by Jiroo.’
If -(r)are were a matching affix, it would require still another grid here (presumably, [AG, GL]. Hence, I assume that the suffix used in direct passives is inheriting: that is, it receives the thematic grid of the verb to which it is attached. The following help illustrate how this is done. (Hereafter, italics are used to indicate the part of a tree structure which is formed in the lexicon.)

(26)

a. **Lexicon**

soodans- ‘to consult’ [ AG, GL] -(r)are [ ]

b. **Affixation**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V [AG, GL] \\
\downarrow \\
V \\
\downarrow \\
soodans- [AG, GL]
\end{array}
\]

According to this, -(r)are starts with an empty grid, but when it is affixed to the verb soodans- ‘to consult’ in the lexicon, the resulting V inherits the thematic roles of the verb [Agent, Goal]

In terms of surface grammatical relations, passive verbs resemble intransitive verbs in not taking an object NP. However, in terms of thematic properties they behave more like transitive verbs in exhibiting the thematic structure [Agent, Theme/(Goal)]. Recall that direct passives allow an overt ni-marked agent argument (though it is optional), and that they can cooccur with a rationale
clause, which requires an Agent role in the matrix sentence (see section 5.1 above).

(27)

a. Uti ga (yanusi ni) yak-are-ta.
   house Nm landlord obl burn-RARE-Pst.
   'The house was burnt (by the landlord).'

b. [PRO hokenkin o tor-u tameni ] uti ga
   insurance Ac take-Pre in-order-to house Nm
   (yasuni ni) yak-are-ta (=8b)
   landlord obl burn-RARE-Pst.
   'The house was burnt (by the landlord) to collect the insurance.'

What this indicates is that the thematic structure of the transitive verb to which -(r)are is affixed is manifested not only in the lexicon but also at all syntactic levels. This is independently required in GB theory by the Projection Principle, which ensures that lexical properties are maintained in each level of syntactic representation (Chomsky 1986).

(28) Projection Principle (Chomsky 1986: 84)

Representations at each syntactic level (i.e. LF, and D- and S-structure) are projected from the lexicon.

The following is the syntactic representation of the passive sentence in (27b), repeated here in (29). (The symbol e marks an empty position.)
(29) [PRO_i hokenkin o tor-u tameni] uti ga
insurance Ac take-Pre in-order-to house Nm

(yanusii ni) yak-are-ta.
landlord Obl burn-RARE-Pst

'The house is burnt (by the landlord) to collect the insurance.'

Lexical entry: yak- [AG,TH]
-(r)are [   ] (Dethematize the external role.)

(Tense markers are omitted in the tree diagram for the purpose of simplicity since they are not relevant to the analysis.)

D-Structure:

```
          IP
           |
          NP  e
          |
          VP
          |
          PP
          |
          IP
          |
          NP
          |
          VP
          |
          IP
          |
          NP
          |
          VP
          |
          PRO hokenkin o toru tameni
          |
          V' [AG, TH]
          |
          V' [AG, TH]
          |
          V' [AG, TH]
          |
          V
          |
          (r)are [   ]
          |
          V
          |
          yak- [AG, TH]
```
Here, the agent role has been 'dethematized' (see chapter 3) in that it is not associated with the usual subject position (specifier of VP). Instead, it is either not overtly realized or is associated with the PP adjunct yanusi ni 'by the landlord'. In the former case, it is called an implicit argument. I repeat here the definition of implicit argument.

(30) Implicit Argument
A thematic role in the thematic grid is an implicit argument iff it is in a structural position to license a phrase (i.e. XP), but no phrase occurs.

S-Structure:
[s Uti ga_i [vp [s [PRO hokenkin o tor-u tameni] yanusi ni ti yak-are-ta]]

As an inheriting suffix, -(r)are initially carries an empty thematic grid [ ]. The thematic roles associated with yak- 'to burn' are inherited and then percolate up to V' level. At the V' level the thematic grid bears a sister-relation to yanusi ni (if present), and licenses the agent role. In addition, if the passive sentence is accompanied by a rationale clause, which is assumed by Roeper (1987) to be attached to VP, the percolated grid (which includes an Agent role) is in a position from which it can c-command and control PRO. Hence, it has an obligatory control reading even where there is no overt phrase.
In the S-structure above, the D-structure object *uti* ‘house’ has been moved to the subject position. This is to avoid a violation of the Case Filter. Because the passive suffix in (29) prevents assignment of the agent role to the subject (Spec of VP) position, the verb loses its ability to assign objective Case due to Burzio’s generalization (repeated below).

(31) Burzio’s generalization (1986)
If a verb does not theta-mark its subject, it cannot Case-mark its object.

*Uti* must therefore move to specifier of IP position in order to get Case, as well as to satisfy the condition on predication.

5.4 Primary Passive and Secondary Passive

Returning now to the unfinished discussion of the difference between the English and Japanese passives, in Japanese either the direct or the indirect object can “advance” to the subject, while in English only the latter does.

(32) English Passives
a. Bill gave the prize to John.
b. The prize was given to John.
c. *John was given the prize to.

(33) Japanese Equivalents
a. Bill ga John ni syoo o atae-ta
   Bill Nm John Obl prize Ac give-Pst
This contrast has to do with whether the indirect object is realized as a noun phrase or prepositional phrase. If one of functions of the passive morpheme is Case absorption, it can have an effect on NPs but not PPs for the former category type requires Case but the latter does not. In Japanese, the indirect object happens to take the shape of a noun phrase, whereas in English it is realized as a prepositional phrase. (I assume that the particle *ni* for the indirect object is a case marker while the one for the demoted subject in the passive is a postposition.)

To see this, let us go back to the English examples above. The following is the D-structure for both (32b) and (32c).

(34) D-structure

\[
\left[ e \text{ was given [NP the prize] [PP to John] } \right]
\]

The verb *give* normally assigns an accusative case to its object, but this case gets absorbed by the passive morpheme. If *the prize* stays where it is, then it cannot receive Case. Therefore, it has to move to the subject position in order to get Case. This is how (32b) is derived.
In (32c), on the other hand, the noun phrase John is moved from within the PP to the subject position. The following is its S-structure.

(35) S-structure
    [ John was given [the prize] [to t] ]

This structure is unacceptable for two reasons. First, the object noun phrase the prize is not Case-marked since the verb has lost its case-assigning ability and no other Case assigner is present. Second, John is assigned two different cases: the objective case that is assigned by the preposition to is assigned to its trace and the nominative case that is assigned by INFL directly to the subject position. Since ‘Case clash’ of this sort is forbidden, the sentence is doubly ill formed.

Now let us discuss the Japanese examples. I assume that the reason that Japanese has both primary and secondary passives is that a verb like atae- ‘to give’ has two Cases to assign—or assign dative and accusative. (See Baker (1989) and Jaeggli (1986) for similar analyses.) If the passive morpheme is affixed to the verb, then one of the cases gets absorbed, leaving one available. If the dative case is absorbed, then (33c) with an accusative-marked NP is the result. On the other hand, if the accusative case is absorbed, then the grammar derives (33b) with a dative-marked NP.
5.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have examined the direct passive, and argued that it involves dethematization and Case absorption. Thus, it has the function of downgrading of the external argument. Given the goal of this dissertation, our next task must be to show that other patterns containing -(r)are have similar properties. With this in mind, I turn in the next chapter to the indirect passive construction.
Notes

1. Of course the following passive is O.K.

   John was given the prize.

   But this is derived from a different source:

   [e was given John the prize]

Notice that John is the direct object of the verb give and occurs as a noun phrase rather than a prepositional phrase.

2. There is disagreement on which noun phrases allow a quantifier to float. Most Japanese linguists say that only the subject and direct object do, but some allow a floated quantifier to be associated with a dative marked argument.

3. Miyagawa (1989) takes mutual c-command between the NP or its trace and the associated quantifier to be the relevant condition.

4. As is well known, many movement analyses can be formulated in non-movement frameworks such as GPSG (Gazdar, Klein, Pullum, and Sag 1985) which make use of ‘feature-passing’ mechanisms, meta rules and the like. However, this is not a concern of this dissertation.
6.1 Introduction

The indirect passive will be discussed separately from the direct passive in this chapter, but this is only for the purposes of expository simplicity. I believe that both the direct and indirect passive are essentially the same structure and that there is one—(r)are, which invariably exhibits the downgrading function identified in the previous chapter. I will start this chapter with the discussion of an apparently major difference between direct and indirect passives, namely the existence of an “extra” NP in the latter pattern.

6.2 The source of the “extra” argument in indirect passive.

As noted earlier, the indirect passive differs from the direct passive in having an extra argument (which I am calling the experiencer). There are basically three possible sources: (i) the base verb, (ii) the suffix, and (iii) base generation.

I take the first position. That is, I claim that it is the base verb that selects the experiencer argument. Before presenting my analysis, I will discuss the second and third positions.
6.2.1 The suffix as the source

It has been commonly assumed by many linguists (e.g., Inoue 1987, Miyagawa 1989, Dubinsky 1985) that the "extra" argument in indirect passives comes from the suffix. Two arguments have been given in support of this claim. The first is based on the fact that the extra noun phrase cannot occur in the active sentence:

(1) **Indirect Passive**
Tanaka-san ga Taroo ni nak-are-ta.
Tanaka-Mr Nm Taroo obl cry-RARE-Pst
'Mr. Tanaka was cried on by Taroo.'

(2) **Active counterpart**
* Taroo ga Tanaka-san ni/o nai-ta.
  Taroo Nm Tanaka-Mr Dat/Ac cry-Pst

Notice that the active sentence (2) above is unacceptable with the phrase *Tanaka-san ni/o* in it. Therefore, these linguists conclude that the "extra" argument must come from the suffix -(r)are, which is only present in the passive.

The second argument is based on the animacy restriction on the "extra" argument. It has been claimed that a selectional restriction is imposed on the subject of indirect passives but not on the subject of direct passives (Dubinsky 1985). That is, the former has to be animate, while the latter need not be.\(^1\)
(3) a. **Indirect passive with an animate subject**

Taroo ga Hirosi ni terebi o itazuras-are-ta.
Taroo Nm Hirosi Obl T.V. Ac play-with-RARE-Pst
'Taroo was affected by Hirosi's putting his television out of commission.'

b. **Indirect passive with an inanimate subject**

* Terebi ga Hirosi ni antena o itazuras-are-ta.
  T.V. Nm Hirosi Obl antenna Ac play-with-RARE-Pst
  'T.V. had its antenna put out of commission by Hiroshi.'

(4) a. **Direct passive with an animate subject**

Taroo ga ooku no hito ni suk-are-te i-ru.
Taroo Nm many Pos people Obl like-RARE-Prg-Pre
'Taroo is loved by many people.'

b. **Direct passive with an inanimate subject**

Kono kissaten ga ooku no hito ni suk-are-te-i-ru.
this coffee-shop Nm many Pos people Obl like-RARE-Pre
'This coffee-shop is loved by many people.'

The sentences in (3) and (4) illustrate that either an animate or an inanimate NP is acceptable as the subject of a direct passive, but only an animate one is permissible in indirect passives. Proponents of the non-uniform analysis interpret this as evidence that the suffix in the indirect passive selects an inanimate NP (corresponding to the "extra" NP, and that the two passives are therefore not the same construction.

If these two arguments are in fact correct, it will be difficult for proponents of this view to maintain the uniform analysis of -(r)are. (Recall that these linguists are in favor of the uniform analysis—see
chapter 4). This is because -(r)are in the direct passive is a mere suffix that does not select an argument while the same morpheme in the indirect passive would have to select an experiencer argument, and would therefore be a different type of morpheme. However, things are not as they appear. I will refute the animacy restriction argument in the next subsection, and in a later section, I will provide an alternative proposal about the source of the "extra" NP.

6.2.1.1 No animacy restriction on the "extra" NP

Although there may be a tendency for the subject of an indirect passive to be animate, there are indirect passive sentences where an inanimate subject is not necessarily excluded. Sentence (5a) is taken from Saito (1982: 102).

(5) **Indirect passive with an inanimate subject**

   a. Nihonsya wa sono keizaisei o takaku
      Japanese-cars Top their economy Ac highly
      hyookas-are-te-iru.
      regard-RARE-Prg-Pre.
   
      'Japanese cars are appreciated for their low cost.'

   b. Tako ga kaze ni huk-are-te, maiagat-ta.
      kite Nm wind Obl blow-RARE fly-up-Pst
      'The kite was blown up into the sky on the wind.'

Also, it has been pointed out by Wierzbicka (1988) that in written Japanese, the range of permissible passives is wider, and that indirect passive sentences with an inanimate subject are more
widely used. She cites the following examples, which are taken from Xolodovic 1974:

(6) **Indirect passive with an inanimate subject**

a. Matsu wa yuki ni eda o or-are-ta.
   pine Top snow by branch Ac break-RARE-Pst.
   'The snow broke the branches of the pine-tree.'

b. Matsu wa hi ni eda o teras-are-ta.
   pine Top sun by branches Ac shine-RARE-Pst.
   'The sun made the branches of the pine-tree shine.'

What these examples indicate, then, is that an indirect passive sentence like (3b) on the previous page is not unacceptable because of any general selectional restriction against inanimate experiencer arguments. (I do not intend to offer an alternative explanation for the unacceptability of (3b) here since it is beyond the scope of this study.) The failure of the alleged animacy restriction undermines support for the claim that the suffix licences the extra NP in indirect passives as well as the claim that there are two -(r)ares. There is no doubt that there is tendency for the subject of indirect passives to be animate, but I believe that this is due to the nature of the thematic role that is assigned to this NP, namely Experiencer, which is normally associated with an animate (or human) element.

We will refute the other argument in support of the nonuniform analysis in section 6.2.3. First, however, it is necessary to say something about the 'base-generation' analysis of the "extra NP" in indirect passives.
6.2.2 The “Extra” NP is base generated.

The idea that the experiencer NP in the indirect passive is base generated is put forward by Saito (1983), who reached this conclusion by a process of elimination. Based on the fact that the extra NP has no corresponding argument in the active sentence, Saito concluded that the base verb is not the source of the “extra” NP. However, he points to the implausibility of the suffix being the source on the grounds that it is strange for the same suffix to have two totally different functions. (That is, in the direct passive the suffix dethematizes the external role and absorbs the objective Case while in the indirect passive it takes the whole clause as a complement and assigns an extra argument.)

Saito concludes that what is left as a possible source of the experiencer NP is base generation as a “focus.” Saito claims that the “focus” is a NP marked with the nominative case marker and base generated freely as the specifier of S, taking the whole S as its sister. Although this focus NP need not be coindexed with any empty argument position in the lower S, it does require an aboutness relation with its sister S. Because the subject in Saito’s system is the NP which takes a VP node as its sister, he differentiates it from the “focus” although they are both assigned a nominative case by being in the position immediately dominated by S.
A typical focus is an NP occurring in a multi-nominative construction.

In (8a) Tanaka-san no okusan ga kiree-da ‘Tanaka’s wife’ is simply the subject argument of the intransitive predicate kiree ‘pretty’. But in (8b), two NPs—Tanaka-san ‘Mr. Tanaka’ and okusan ‘wife’—occur with the nominative marker. Saito calls the the first NP the focus and the second the subject.
Saito then attempts to extend this analysis to indirect passives.

After eliminating the two competing possibilities as a source of the extra argument in indirect passives, and knowing that this noun phrase is marked with the nominative case marker, Saito concluded that it must be focus and is base generated. The following is Saito’s analysis of the indirect passive.

(10) (= Saito’s (19) in p.100)
[ s John ga yuukaimaj ni [s PROi musuko o yuukais-are-ta] ]
John Nm kidnapper obl son Ac kidnap-RARE-Pst
‘John’s son was kidnapped by a kidnapper.’
(Saito does not say what kind of node the PP yuukaima ni is attached to, so X is used here.)

Saito assumes that there is a PRO as the subject of the lower clause; the PRO in this structure is then coindexed with yuukaima ni by an operation which Saito does not discuss. However, what guarantees the coindexing of PRO with the ni-marked NP that is required to represent the correct interpretation of the sentence? Saito considers this phrase to be an adverbial phrase. As has been noted in various frameworks based on data from various languages, the controller of PRO in human language is normally either the subject or the object. From a typological point of view, it is very difficult to be convinced that an adverbial phrase or even an oblique argument could be the controller, as Saito’s analysis requires.
6.2.3 The base verb as the source of the Extra NP

Contrary to the two approaches just outlined, the position that I take is that the base verb is the source of the “extra” NP in indirect passives. Knowing that the “extra” NP does not have a corresponding argument in the active sentence, it is natural to wonder how this can be possible.

To answer this question, we first have to consider what is needed in order for a lexical noun phrase to be licensed as an argument of a verb. There are two conditions that must be satisfied: (i) the NP has to have a thematic role for interpretation in LF, and (ii) it has to receive Case. We know that the experiencer role is available in indirect passives, and I will assume for now that this thematic role is also available in active sentences. This then eliminates the possibility that the inadmissibility of an experiencer NP in active sentences is due to the lack of a thematic role. This leaves the lack of Case as the reason that the experiencer noun phrase which appears in indirect passives cannot be lexically realized in their active counterparts (and therefore must remain as an implicit argument).

Let us consider this claim with the help of the following examples.

(11)

a. Kodomo ga sawai-da. [AG]
   child Nm make commotion-Pst
   ‘The child made a commotion.’
b. *Kodomo ga Taroo ni/(o) sawai-da. [AG, EX]
   child Nm Taroo dat/Ac make commotion-Pst
   'The child made a commotion, affecting Taroo.'

The verb sawag- 'to make a commotion' selects an agent role as its external argument, and may optionally subcategorize an experiencer role as its internal argument (corresponding to the person affected by the commotion). If nothing more is required, then both (11a) and (11b) should be acceptable. But, in fact, only the former sentence is acceptable.

I assume that the reason why Taroo, the Experiencer argument, cannot appear in (11b) is that sawag- 'to make commotion' has no Case to assign to it. Thus, even though the noun phrase Taroo is inserted as complement of the verb, it won't receive Case as long as it stays in that position. The question, then, is this: Is there any position to which it can move and receive Case? The subject position (i.e. the specifier of IP) could be such a position. (Note that the specifier of VP is not available since the external argument is linked to that position.) However, I assume that movement of the experiencer argument to the specifier of IP (where it could receive the nominative case) is blocked by the following principle.
(12) **Thematic Hierarchy Principle**

The hierarchical relation among arguments in S-structure must respect the hierarchy: AG > EXP > TH unless a morphological process specifically licenses an alternative hierarchy.

If *Taroo* in (11b) moves to the specifier of IP and receives the nominative case, then it violates the principle since there is no morphological process to allow the experiencer argument to be higher than the agentive one.

(13) *Taroo ga kodomo ga sawai-da.*

Taroo Nm child Nm make-commotion-Pst

Hence, there is no unfilled case position for *Taroo* to move to without violating Thematic Hierarchy Principle, and the sentence is unacceptable, violating the Case Filter.
However, this changes when the passive suffix is affixed to the base verb. Recall that the affixation dethematizes the external role, dissociating it from the subject position. This in turn creates a position to which the experiencer noun phrase can move and get Case.

(14)

a. Taroo ga kodomo ni sawag-are-ta
   Taroo Nm child obl make commotion-RARE-Pst
   'Taroo was made a commotion by the child.'

b. D-structure

   [e [Kodomo ni Taroo sawag-are-ta] ]

   IP
   /   
  NP  VP
   /   /   
  e  V'  Pst
    /   
   PP  V'
      /   
    kodomo ni  NP  V
         /   /   |
        Taroo sawag-are-ta

c. S-Structure

   [Taroo ga kodomo ni t sawag-are-ta] ]
The argument Taroo in (14b) can move to the specifier of IP, where it receives Case.

In summary, I have proposed that Case theory explains why the experiencer argument can be realized only in the passive sentence, but not in the active sentence. In the following two sections, I will present arguments to support my claim.

6.2.3.1 Cross-linguistic facts

In this section I will show that the analysis that I am presenting for the indirect passive is supported by cross-linguistic data.

While the experiencer argument in Japanese cannot be realized in active sentences due to the lack of Case, there are languages in which such an argument can be explicitly realized as an internal argument in this sort of pattern. What's more, in at least one of these languages this argument can also be realized as the subject of a passive.

Many Indo-European languages (e.g. German, Spanish, etc.) exhibit a so-called 'ethical dative' pattern. Interestingly, this ethical dative is very similar to the experiencer argument in the Japanese indirect passive. The following are examples from French. (These examples are taken from Wierzbicka (1988))
French examples

(15)

a. Intransitive verb
Il courait derrière elle.
he ran behind her
'He was running behind her.'

b. Intransitive with an ethical dative
Il lui courait derrière.
he to-her ran behind
'He was running behind her; she was affected by it.'

(16)

a. Transitive verb
Elle essuyait son front.
she wiped his forehead
'She wiped his forehead.'

b. Transitive with an ethical dative
Elle lui essuyait le front.
she to-him wiped the forehead
'She wiped his forehead; he was affected by it.'

In the (b) sentences, a dative-marked argument is added. As seen from their translations, the referent of the argument is somehow affected by the event or the action of the referent of the subject. Notice that this argument is semantically very similar to the experiencer argument of the Japanese indirect passive already discussed. The following are the Japanese equivalents of the French examples.
(17) **The equivalents of (15a) and (15b)**

a. Kare wa kanozyo no usiro o hasitte-i-ta.
   he Top she Gen behind Ac run-Prog-Pst
   'He was running behind her.'

b. Kanozyo wa kare ni usiro o hasir-are-ta.
   she Top he Obl back Ac run-RARE-Pst
   'She was affected by his running behind her.'

(18) **The equivalents of (16a) and (16b)**

a. Kanozyo wa kare no hitai o huita.
   she Top he Gen forehead Ac wipe-Pst
   'She wiped his forehead.'

b. Kare wa kanozyo ni hitai o huk-are-ta.
   he Top she Obl forehead Ac wipe-RARE-Pst.
   'He was affected by her wiping off his forehead.'

An interesting fact here is that there is no morphological change in
the predicate in French in order to express the affectedness notion;
the experiencer argument is simply added as an internal argument.

English does not have the same type of construction, but when
the experiencer role in English is realized, it often takes the form of a
prepositional phrase in which a preposition guarantees Case for the
NP. For instance:

**English examples**

(19) a. John died.
   
   b. John died on his wife.
(20) a. It rained.
    b. It rained on me.

Many Germanic languages also have an 'ethical dative'. In most of them, this NP is not allowed to become the subject in a passive sentence. The following example is from German.

(21) Das/Sein Fahrrad ist dem kind geklaut worden.  
    the/his bike-Nm is the child-Dat stolen become  
    'His bike was stolen, and the child was affected by it.'

Only the direct object can become the subject in the German passive. In west Flemish, however, the 'ethical dative' can become the subject.

(22) Jan is zenen velo gepakt (Taken from Abney 1987)  
    Jan-Nm is his bike stolen  
    'Jan got his bike stolen.'

A similar example in Chinese is cited in Li (1990: 67-99), who observes that the experiencer argument can be realized as an internal complement of the verb without any morphological change in the verb and that it can be passivized.

(23) Active sentence with an affectee argument (from Li 1990: 89)  
    Tufei ba ta sha le fuqin.  
    bandits BA him kill Aspect father  
    'The bandits killed his father, (and he was affected).
(24) **Passive counterpart** (Li 1990: 92)

Ta bei tufei ba fuqin sha le.
he by bandit BA father kill Aspect
His father was killed by the bandit.
(He was affected by the father’s killing by the bandit.)

To summarize, with the help of cross-linguistic data I have argued the plausibility of my claim that the source of the experiencer argument in the Japanese indirect passive is the base verb. I have shown that there are languages (e.g. French, German, etc.) in which an argument very similar to the experiencer argument in the Japanese indirect passive can be realized as an internal argument. An interesting fact about these languages is that the addition of an experiencer argument does not involve any morphological change in the predicate. Hence, it is presumably the ‘base’ verb that selects the argument.

We have also shown that whereas the affectee argument cannot be passivized in French and German, it can be in W. Flemish and Chinese—yielding a structure that looks very much like the Japanese indirect passive. The following table summarizes these facts.
Table 6.1
Affectee arguments in various languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp. appears as an internal argument</th>
<th>Exp. appears as the subject of passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Flemish/Chinese</td>
<td>(Yes)²</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French/German</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3.2 Arguments for the presence of an implicit experiencer role in Japanese

I will now substantiate the claim that the experiencer role, which is lexically realized only in the indirect passive in Japanese, is also present in the active sentence as an implicit argument in the thematic grid. To do this, I will present an argument to show the existence of an implicit experiencer argument—i.e. an argument that is not lexically realized in a particular syntactic position, but like the implicit argument discussed in chapter 5 is still present. The relevant argument is based on object honorifics, which are often said to be one of the constructions peculiar to Japanese.

Japanese has a system of exaltation that is realized by adjusting the morphological form of a predicate. When a non-subject argument refers to a person socially superior to the referent of subject, the verb may appear in the infinitive/stem form
accompanied by the discontinuous morpheme o..... suru to “exalt” or to “honorify” him or her. The following are examples of this.

(25) **The referent of the direct object is superior**

a. Taroo ga Tanaka-sensei o mat-ta.
   Taroo Nm Tanaka-teacher Ac wait-Pst
   ‘Taroo waited for Prof.Tanaka.’

b. Taroo ga Tanaka-sensei o o-mati-si-ta
   Taroo Nm Tanaka-teacher Ac wait-OH-Pst

(26) **The referent of an oblique complement is superior**

a. Taroo ga Tanaka-sensei kara kii-ta
   Taroo Nm Tanaka-teacher from hear-Pst
   ‘Taroo heard it from Prof.Tanaka.’

b. Taroo ga Tanaka-sensei kara o-kiki-si-ta.
   Taroo Nm Tanaka-teacher from hear-OH-Pst.

In these examples, the referent of *Tanaka-sensei* (which bears a non-subject grammatical relation) is socially superior to the referent of the subject *Taroo*, hence the verbs may appear with the object honorific (hereafter OH) morphology, and the former individual is exalted. However, if the referent of the subject is superior to that of a non-subject argument, this morphological alternation is not possible, as (27) illustrates.
(27) **The referent of the subject is superior**

*Tanaka-sensee ga Taroo o o-mati-si-ta.*

Tanaka-teacher Nm Taroo Ac wait-OH-Pst

‘Prof. Tanaka waited for Taroo.

In (27), the referent of *Taroo* is inferior to the referent of *Tanaka-sensee*. Hence, object honorification is not possible.

If the NP referring to the socially superior individual is an adjunct, the alternation is not possible. Compare (28) with (29) below. The phrase *Tanaka-sensee to* ‘with Prof. Tanaka’ is an argument in (28) but an adjunct in (29).

(28) **The referent of an oblique argument is superior**

a. *No honorification*

Watasi ga gakkoo de *Tanaka-sensee to* at-ta.
I Nm school at Tanaka-teacher with meet-Pst

‘I met with my teacher at school.’

b. *With honorification*

Watasi ga gakkoo de *Tanaka-sensee to* o-ai-si-ta.
I Nm school at Tanaka-teacher with meet-OH-Pst

(29) **The referent of an adjunct is superior**

a. *No honorification*

Watasi ga kyoo gakkoo de *Tanaka-sensee to*
I Nm today school at Tanaka-teacher with

haha o mat-ta.
mother Ac wait-Pst

‘I waited for my mother at school with Prof. Tanaka.’
b. With honorification

*Watasi ga kyoo gakkoo de Tanaka-sensee to
 I Nm today school at Tanaka-teacher with

haha o o-mati-si-ta.
mother Ac wait-OH-Pst.

As predicted, object honorification is allowed in (28), but not in (29).

It has been noted (e.g. Dubinsky 1985) that a genitive expressing possession by an exalted person can also ‘trigger’ object honorification.

(30) The referent of a genitive in the direct object is superior
Sensee no zidoozya o o-arai-si-ta.
teacher Gen car Ac wash-OH-Pst.
‘I washed the teacher’s car.’

This is possible only when the possessor is part of a non-subject argument. Thus, if it is part of an adjunct, the alternation is not possible, as (31) illustrates.

(31) The referent of the possessor within an adjunct is superior
a. Sensee no otaku de Taroo o mat-ta.
teacher Gen house at Taroo Ac wait-Pst
‘I waited for Taroo at the teacher’ house.’

b. *Sensee no otaku de Taroo o o-mati-sita.
teacher Gen house at Taroo Ac wait-OH-Pst.
‘I waited for Taroo at the teacher’s house.’

In (31) the genitive is in a locative adjunct, and the sentence is unacceptable with the OH morphology.
We see, then that non-subject arguments (as well as genitives in a non-subject argument) are the possible targets of object exaltation. A curious fact about this construction is that the individual who is exalted does not have to be overtly mentioned, though his involvement has to be implied. Hence, if a sentence denotes one person’s action without another person’s involvement, it is very odd with the OH morphology. For instance:

(32)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Taroo ga otya o non-da} \\
& \text{Taroo Nm tea Ac drink-Pst} \\
& \text{‘Taroo had tea.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{??Taroo ga otya o o-nomi-si-ta} \\
& \text{Taroo Nm tea Ac drink-OH-Pst}
\end{align*}

If this sentence is perceived as a neutral description of someone drinking tea, then it is difficult to think that someone else is involved. OH therefore seems strange since there is no triggering argument of the appropriate type. However, by creating a situation involving a second person in the event, the sentence can be made perfectly acceptable, as (33) illustrates. (The phrase sensei ni kawatte ‘on behalf of the teacher’ is used to help create the appropriate situation.)

(33) Sensee ni kawatte, [IP Taroo ga otya o o-nomi-si-ta.] 
teacher dat on-behalf-of Taroo Nm tea Ac drink-OH-Pst
‘On behalf of the teacher, Taroo drank the tea.’
Note that the second person is still unmentioned in the main sentence itself. We claim that the OH alternation is possible in this sentence because there is an implicit internal argument in the theta grid of *nom*- 'to drink,' and its presence is highlighted with the help of the adjunct *sensee ni kawatte* 'on behalf of the teacher.' That argument corresponds to person for whose experience the event was produced by the agent.

People may object to this claim by saying that *sensei* 'teacher' in (33) rather than the co-referential null internal argument that I posit "triggers" the object honorification based on pragmatics. However, it is strange to say that an NP in an adverbial phrase can somehow license the occurrence of object honorification when we have already seen that the referent of an adjunct cannot be the target of the exaltation.

Notice that the unmentioned referent in the object honorific construction shares some similarity with the experiencer NP which appears in indirect passives in how it relates to the event, in that its involvement is involuntary. Recall that the referent of the experiencer NP in indirect passives is also involuntarily involved into the event.

We have shown that the referent of a non-subject argument (but not an adjunct) can "trigger" object honorification. Based on this, we conclude that there is an implicit internal argument in the grid of the base verb to license the OH alternation in sentences such as (33). This in turn supports my claim about the source of the experiencer
argument in indirect passives. Thus, Japanese verbs may have an experiencer argument that remains implicit in active sentences (due to lack of Case) but can be overtly realized in passive sentences (when it can move to the subject position). This latter option yields the indirect passive construction.

6.3 The analysis of indirect passives

In the previous sections, we have argued that the base verb, not the passive suffix, subcategorizes an experiencer NP as an internal argument which can appear as the subject in indirect passives. This allows us to maintain that the suffix -(r)are in either the direct or the indirect passive is not a thematic role assigner. In this section, we will discuss how indirect passives are represented.

I take the position that the -(r)are morpheme used in indirect passives is not different from the one in the direct passive; hence it is an inheriting affix. To confirm this, first consider the following examples, each of which contains an external argument with a different thematic role.

(34) **Active sentences**
   a. External argument = Agent
      Taroo ga Ziroo o nagut-ta.
      Taroo Nm Ziroo Ac hit-Pst
      ‘Taroo hit Ziroo.’
b. External argument = Source
Sir-ana-i otoko ga Hanako ni hana o okut-ta
know-not-Pres man Nm Hanako Dat flowers Ac send-Pst
‘A stranger sent flowers to Hanako.’

c. External argument = Instrument
Sensya ga uti zentai o torikakon-da.
tank Nm house whole Ac surround-Pst
‘The tanks surrounded the whole house.’

(35) Indirect Passives
a. Hanako ga Taroo ni Ziroo o nagur-are-ta. (Agent)
Hanako Nm Taroo Obl Ziroo Ac hit-RARE-Pst
‘Hanako was affected by Taroo’s hitting of Ziroo.’

b. Taroo ga sir-ana-i otoko kara konyakusya no
Taroo Nm know-not-Pres man from fiancee Gen
Hanako ni hana o okur-rare-ta. (Source)
Hanako Dat flowers Ac send-RARE-Pst.
‘Taroo was affected by a stranger’s sending of flowers to his fiancee Hanako.’

c. Tanaka-san ga sensya ni/(de) uti zentai o (Instrument)
Tanaka-Mr. Nm tank Obl/by house whole Ac
torikakom-are-ta.
surround-RARE-Pst
‘Mr.Tanaka’s whole house was surrounded by the tanks.’

The sentences in (34) are active sentences, and those in (35) are their indirect passive counterparts. The theta roles of the subjects in (34a), (34b) and (34c) are the same as those of the “demoted” noun phrase in (35a), (35b) and (35c), respectively. As in the case of the direct passive, if -(r)are in the indirect passive were a matching affix,
it would have to be associated with a variety of thematic grids. This in turn would require the postulation of several different -(r)are's—an unacceptable option.

A second reason for treating the indirect passive suffix as inheriting is that it can attach to various verbs other than transitives. This is parallel to the observation made in our earlier discussion of the direct passive—see chapter 5.

(36) Verb with [Agent, Goal]
   a. Haha ga iyaiya boku no konyakusya ni
      mother Nm unwillingly I Gen fiancee Dat
      at-ta.
      meet-Pst

      ‘My mother unwillingly met my fiancee.’

   b. Boku wa iyaiya haha ni konyakusya ni
      I Top unwillingly mother Obl fiancee Dat
      aw-are-ta.
      meet-RARE-Pst

      ‘I was affected by my mother’s meeting my fiancee unwillingly.’

(37) Intransitive verb
   a. Kodomo ga arui-ta
      child Nm walk-Pst
      ‘The child walked.’
b. Taroo ga kodomo ni heya o kitanai asi de
Taroo Nm child Obl room Loc dirty feet with
aru-k-are-ta.
wak-RARE-Pst

'Taroo was affected by the child’s walking around the room with the dirty feet.'

Hence, I assume that the -(r)are found in the indirect passive is also inheriting in Roeper's (1987) technical sense; i.e., its grid inherits the thematic roles of the base verb.

I will now attempt to employ this conclusion to analyze the indirect passive. Recall that the difference between the direct and indirect passive is that in the former, the logical object (i.e., either the direct or indirect object) becomes the surface subject, whereas in the latter, the experiencer argument becomes the subject. Compare the indirect passive (38c) with the direct passive (38b).

(38) a. Active sentence
Ooya ga uti o yai-ta.
landlord Nm house Ac burn-Pst
'The landlord burned the house.'

b. Direct passive
Uti ga ooya ni yak-are-ta.
house Nm landlord Obl burn-RARE-Pst
'The house was burned down by the landlord.'

c. Indirect passive
Tanaka-san ga ooya ni uti o yak-are-ta.
Tanaka-Mr. Nm landlord Obl house Ac burn-RARE-Pst
'Mr. Tanaka had his house burned down by the landlord.'
Notice that the accusative case is absorbed in the direct passive, but not in the indirect passive. I will explain why this is so with the help of the following tree structure, which is the syntactic representation of the indirect passive sentence (38c).

(39)

a. **Lexical entry:** yak- [AG, EX, TH] 
   -(r)are [ ] (Dethematize the external role.)

b. **D-Structure**

```
       IP
      /  \
     NP   I'

       VP
      /  \
     I    I

       Pst

       V' [AG, EX, TH]
       /    \
      PP   V'

       V' [AG, EX, TH]
       /    \
      NP   V'

       V' [AG, EX, TH]

       Tanaka-san
       /    \
      NP   uti

       V [AG, EX, TH]
       /    \
      uti   -(r)are [ ]

       yak- [AG, EX, TH]
```

c. **S-Structure:**

```
[ IP Tanaka-san ga [VP ooya ni t uti o yak-are-ta. ] ]
```
As an inheriting suffix, -(r)are initially carries an empty thematic grid [ ]. It inherits the thematic grid of yak- ‘to burn’, which percolates up to the V’ level.

In the S-structure above, the experiencer has been moved to the specifier of IP to receive Case so as not to violate the Case filter. But recall that the one consequence of using the passive suffix is loss of the verb’s objective case (by Burzio’s generalization—see chapter 3). How then can uti ‘house’ maintain the accusative case in the indirect passive? For now, I can only suggest that if a verb has the ability to assign the objective case, it can maintain this property even if the passive suffix is attached as long as an NP other than its direct object moves into the specifier of IP.

There is another possible derivation. Compare the following with the S-structure above.

(40) S-Structure:

* [ IP Uti ga [VP ooya ni Tanaka-san t yak-are-ta.] ]

Here the suffix absorbs the objective case, so that uti ‘house’ instead of Tanaka-san ‘Mr.Tanaka’ can move into the subject position to receive Case. However, this is not an acceptable derivation, for Tanaka-san ‘Mr.Tanaka’ has no place to get Case. Even if the verb retains the ability to assign the accusative case, that case would be assigned to the trace, not to Tanaka-san ‘Mr.Tanaka’ since it is the
sister NP of the verb. (Recall that the accusative case is assigned only to the verb's sister NP.) Hence, the derivation is unacceptable since Tanaka-san 'Mr.Tanaka' does not receive Case.

Indirect passives can also occur with a rationale clause, which is expected since the agent role is maintained in this construction.

(41) Indirect passive with a rationale clause
Tanaka-san ga [PRO hokenkin o tor-u tame ni]
Tanaka-Mr. Nm insurance Ac collect-Pres in-order-to

oooya ni uti o yak-are-ta.
landlord Obl house Ac burn-RARE-Pst.

'Mr. Tanaka's house was burnt by the landlord to collect the insurance.'

We assume that a rationale clause is attached to the VP node and that the percolated grid (which includes an agent role) is therefore in a position from which it can control the PRO. (See section 3.4 of chapter 3)

6.4 Apparent counterexamples

I have taken the position that the experiencer argument in indirect passives is internal, and that it moves into the specifier position of IP. Miyagawa (1989) on the other hand claims that the experiencer role is assigned by the passive suffix as an external argument. Hence, indirect passives do not involve movement in his account. Miyagawa presents very interesting sets of examples
involving quantifier “float” to support his claim. Recall that the direct object NP and the associated quantifier phrase can be separated by the subject, but that the subject NP and the associated quantifier cannot be separated by the object. Thus, (42b) is acceptable, but not (43b).

(42)
   a. The object NP and its associated quantifier in adjacent position
      Tomodati ga hon o san-satu kat-ta.
      friend Nm book Ac three buy-Pst
      'My friend bought three books.'
   
      b. The subject NP intervenes between the object NP and its associated quantifier
      Hon o Taroo ga san-satu kat-ta.
      book Ac Taroo Nm three buy-Pst

(43) a. The subject NP and its associated quantifier in adjacent position
      Tomodati ga san-nin hon o kat-ta.
      friend Nm three book Ac buy-Pst
      'Three of my friends bought books.'
   
      b. The object NP intervenes between the subject and its associated quantifier
      *Tomodati ga hon o san-nin kat-ta.
      friend Nm book Ac three buy-Pst

It is also the case that the logical object in a direct passive and an associated quantifier phrase can be separated by another element in the VP.
(44) **Direct passive with a quantifier**

a. The subject and its associated quantifier in adjacent position

Tomodati ga san-nin yakuza ni nagur-are-ta.
friend Nm three gang Obl hit-RARE-Pst
'Three of my friends were hit by the gang.'

b. The logical subject intervenes between the subject and its associated quantifier

Tomodati ga yakuza ni san-nin nagur-are-ta.
friend Nm gang Obl three hit-RARE-Pst

These facts have been accounted for in GB by assuming that the object of a transitive verb in scrambling patterns and the subject of a passive verb are in fact moved from the object position. In the case of direct passive above, for instance, tomodati 'friend' is in the object position at D-structure, and it moves to the subject position leaving a trace behind. Hence, the trace and the quantifier can maintain the adjacency relation.

Keeping this in mind, examine the following examples from Miyagawa.

(45) **Indirect Passive with a quantifier**

a. The subject and its associated quantifier in adjacent position

Tomodati ga hutari dareka ni kuruma o nusum-are-ta.
friend Nm two someone Obl car Ac steal-RARE-Pst
'Two of my friends' cars were stolen.'

b. The logical subject intervenes between the subject and its associated quantifier

Tomodati ga hutari dareka ni kuruma o
friend Nm someone Obl two car Ac
nusum-are-ta
steal-RARE-Pst
The indirect passive does not seem to allow another element to intervene between the subject and the quantifier. This pattern behaves more like the transitive structure in (43b) above. Miyagawa concludes that the subject of an indirect passive is linked to the subject position at D-structure, and that it does not undergo NP movement. If true, this would undermine my claim that this element is an internal argument in D-structure.

Fortunately, Miyagawa’s observation seems to be no more than a tendency, as there are indirect passive sentences which allow their subject and its quantifier to be separated by another element.

(46)  
Tomodati ga densya no naka de hutari
Friend Nm train Gen inside in two

saihu o sur-are-ta (no-yo).
wallet Ac pick-pocket-RARE-Pst.

‘Two of my friends were also stolen their wallets in the train yesterday.’

(47)  
Sensyuu boku no tomodati mo gakkoo de hutari
last-week I Gen friend also school at two

kuruma o nusum-are-ta
car Ac steal-RARE-Pst

‘Last week two of my friends were also stolen their cars at school.’
(48) Kono kinzyo no hito ga keisatu ni hutari
this neighborhood Gen person Nm police Obl two
kuruma o motteik-are-ta (soo desu).
car Ac take-RARE-Pst (I-hear)
'I hear that two of our neighbors were taken their cars by the police.'

(49) Uti no niwa no matsu no ki ga yuki de
house Gen garden Gen pine Gen tree Nm snow with
nihon eda o or-are-ta.
two branches Ac break-RARE-Pst
'Two of the pine trees in our garden were broken
their branches by snow.'

On my account, the grammaticality of these sentences suggests that
the subject argument has moved to its S-structure position from a
position adjacent to the quantifier inside the VP. This supports my
contention that the experiencer subject in an indirect passive is an
internal argument in D-structure.

It is not my intention to provide a general analysis of numeral
quantifiers here. I am merely suggesting that the sentences above
show that there is NP movement in the indirect passive and that
there must be some (non-syntactic) explanation for why the NP-
quantifier relationship in Miyagawa's example (45b) is bad.
6.5 Summary and conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined indirect passives. The crucial claim is that verbs in Japanese subcategorize an optional experiencer argument which cannot receive Case in a VP-internal position but which can be realized as subject when the external role of the base verb has been dethematized. Contrary to the common view that direct and indirect passives have fundamentally different properties, I have argued here that they are essentially the same, and that there is only one passive suffix, which serves in both cases to downgrade the external role by dethematizing it. In the next chapter, I will try to extend this hypothesis to include spontaneous constructions.
Notes

1. It was claimed by Inoue (1976) and McCawley (1972) that the subject of indirect passives must be animate, while those of direct passives may be nonanimate.
2. Abney does not actually cite a sentence with an ethical dative in W. Flemish, but he seems to be saying that the language has it.
3. Miyagawa does not believe that a quantifier phrase "floats" out of a NP but that it is base-generated in the position. I am using the term simply because it is commonly used to refer to this construction.
CHAPTER 7
The spontaneous

7.1 Introduction
In this chapter, we will apply our downgrading analysis to another p-suffix construction: the spontaneous, which corresponds roughly in meaning to the English ergative construction.1 (See Keyser and Roeper 1984.)

(1)  
   a. The vase broke.
   b. The ship sank.

Like the English ergative, the Japanese spontaneous is used to encode an event that takes place spontaneously without the perceived intervention of an agent. The spontaneous construction is the most constrained of the p-suffix structures for it can be built only upon a transitive verb whose thematic structure is [AG, TH]. Thus, (2b) is acceptable, but not (2a).

(2) Spontaneous
   a. okur- ‘to send’ [AG, GL, TH]
      *Hon ga okur-e-ta.2
      book Nm send-RARE-Pst
      ‘The book was sent.’

   b. yak- ‘to burn’ [AG, TH]
      Uti ga yak-e-ta.
      house Nm burn-RARE-Pst
      ‘The house was burnt down.’
Notice that the suffix involved in this construction is -e instead of -(r)are. (For discussion see chapter 2.)

On the surface, the spontaneous construction looks very much like an agentless passive in terms both of the elements it affects and the structure that results. Compare the spontaneous sentence in (2b) with the following passive sentence.

(3) Direct passive

\begin{verbatim}
Uti ga yak-are-ta.
house Nm burn-RARE-Pst
'The house was burnt down.'
\end{verbatim}

First of all, note that both the spontaneous and the agentless passive consist of the same elements—they contain a NP bearing the nominative case marker and a transitive base verb followed by a p-suffix and the past tense suffix. The similarities do not stop here. In both spontaneous and passive, the theme argument of the base verb is the surface subject. Not surprising, in some cases, these two constructions can be used interchangably. (See section 7.4. for discussion.) However, I will show that despite these similarities the spontaneous is an independent construction with its own properties, as its morphology suggests.

There are two other issues that I would like to address in this chapter. The first involves the status of -e. Although we are treating this element as a suffix, there is an opposing view that -e is a non-morphemic component of an inherently intransitive verb (e.g.
Shibatani 1985, Jacobsen 1982). Let us take the spontaneous verb ure- ‘something sells’ to illustrate these two views.

(4) Two different views of the derivation of ure- ‘something sells
   a. bimorphemic  ---------  ur- + e-
   b. monomorphemic  ---------  ure-

Whereas I adopt the bimorphemic analysis and take ure- to be a derived verb consisting of the transitive verb ur- ‘to sell’ followed by the spontaneous suffix -e, the monomorphemic view simply treats this form as a lexically primitive verb. I will provide arguments below in support of the bimorphemic view.

The second issue to be dealt with in this chapter has to do with whether the suffix -e is the sole marker of the spontaneous in Japanese, for it has been claimed by Shibatani that -(r)are can be used as a spontaneous marker. However, I take the position that -e is in fact the sole marker of the spontaneous construction.

7.2 Property of the spontaneous

In this section, I will discuss the property unique to the spontaneous construction, namely the thematic intransitivity that gives it the monadic thematic grid [Theme]. Recall that the spontaneous is built upon a transitive verb. Were it the same construction as the passive, it would maintain the Agent and Theme
arguments of the base verb. However, I will show that the agent argument is simply absent in the spontaneous construction.

There are three arguments that I would like to present for the thematic intransitivity of the spontaneous construction. The first argument involves the admissibility of a *ni*-marked NP corresponding to the 'demoted' agent. Examine the following passive and spontaneous sentences:

(5) **Direct passive**
```
Sara ga Taroo ni war-are-ta.
plate Nm Taroo Obl break-RARE-Pst
'The plate was broken by Taroo.'
```

(6) **Spontaneous**
```
*Sara ga Taroo ni war-e-ta.
Plate Nm Taroo Obl break-RARE-Pst
'The place broke by Taroo.'
```

The spontaneous does not allow an agent PP, whereas the passive does, as we already know. Thus, (5) is acceptable, but not (6). This itself does not tell us whether the Agent role is truly absent in the spontaneous, for there could be an implicit argument which cannot be realized due to the lack of Case. The next piece of data will provide a deeper insight into this issue.

The second argument for thematic intransitivity of the spontaneous involves rationale clauses. Recall that a rationale clause can cooccur with a matrix clause which contains an agentive NP, and that the Agent can control PRO in a rationale clause. More
importantly, the Agent need not be lexically realized in order to control PRO in a rationale clause, as shown by the following construction in which the implicit agent argument associated with the matrix passive verb is the controller.

(7) **Passive with a rationale clause**

[PRO hokenkin o tor-u tameni] uti ga
insurance Ac take-Pres in-order-to house Nm

yak-are-ta.
burn-RARE-Pst.

‘The house was burnt to collect the insurance.’

Compare this sentence with the following spontaneous sentence with the same rationale clause.

(8) **Spontaneous with a rationale clause**

*[PRO hokenkin o tor-u tameni] uti ga
insurance Ac take-Pres in-order-to house Nm

yak-e-ta.
burn-RARE-Pst.

In terms of their component elements, these two sentences are virtually the same. However, with regards to the ability to cooccur with a rationale clause they are very different. That is, the passive can cooccur with it, but not the spontaneous, as (7) and (8) illustrate. From this we can conclude that the spontaneous is associated only
with a theme role, while the passive is associated with both a theme and a (sometimes invisible) agent role.

The third piece of evidence against the presence of an agent argument in spontaneous constructions comes from an important lexical restrictions on its formation. A verb which can be made into a spontaneous form has to satisfy at least two conditions: (i) it must be transitive, and (ii) it must not have a corresponding ergative verb. (Ergative verbs are considered lexically primitive since they exhibit no derivational affix; -(r)u in the following examples is an inflectional affix marking tense.)

(9) Transitive form  Ergative form  Spontaneous form
a. yak-u 'burns X'  ø  yak-e-ru 'X burns'
b. yabur-u 'tears X'  ø  yabur-e-ru 'X tears'
c. mitas-u 'fills X'  miti-ru 'is filled'  *mitas-e-ru 'is filled'
d. naos-u 'fixes X'  naor-u 'recovers'  *naos-e-ru 'recovers'

All these verbs satisfy the first condition, but only yak-u 'burns' and yabur-u 'tears' satisfy the second condition. Thus, yak-e-ru 'burns' and yabur-e-ru 'tears' are possible, but *mitas-e-ru 'is filled' and *naos-e-ru 'recovers' are impossible, because they have corresponding ergative verbs—mitir-u 'is filled' and naor-u 'recovers', respectively. This is exactly what Aronoff's (1976) Blocking Constraint, paraphrased in (10), predicts.
(10) **Blocking Constraint**

Word formation cannot apply when its output would have lexical properties identical to those of an already existing form.

The ergative verbs *miti-ru* 'is filled' and *naor-u* 'is fixed' have only a Theme role in their thematic grid. If the function of the spontaneous affix `-e` is to eliminate the Agent role from the theta grid of the verb to which it is attached, *mitas-e-ru* and *naos-e-ru* would also end up with only a Theme role. Since they would therefore be identical to their lexically primitive ergative counterparts, their formation is blocked by Aronoff's principle. In contrast, no such problem arises in the case of verbs such as *yak-e-ru* 'x burns' and *yabur-e-ru* 'x tears' since these forms have no ergative counterparts to block the spontaneous.

Interestingly this is also an argument for the claim that `-e` is a suffix. If `-e` is part of an intransitive verb base, we cannot explain the blocking of spontaneous forms like *mitas-e* 'be filled,' or *naos-e* 'to recover'. That is, if both ergatives and spontaneous are lexically primitive, there is no reason for the ergative to survive over the spontaneous.

In summary, we presented three arguments in this section to show the absence of the Agent in the spontaneous construction.
7.3 The 'pseudo'-spontaneous

Before presenting my analysis of the spontaneous construction, I will discuss sentences with -(r)are that have spontaneous meanings. As noted above, it has been claimed that these are also spontaneous structures. Below, I will show that these forms are instances of the passive rather than the spontaneous construction, consistent with their morphology. In the meantime, I will refer to them as 'pseudo-spontaneous', and divide them into two groups based on the kind of verbal base involved: (i) psychological verbs, (i.e., emotive and cognitive predicates), and (ii) non-psychological verbs.

Table 7.1

Kinds of verbal base for the pseudo-spontaneous

Non-psychological verbs:  
- *hatak-u* ‘to hit’,  
- *aruk-u* ‘to walk’

Psychological verbs:  
- (i) emotive  
  - e.g. *konom-u* ‘to be fond of’
- (ii) cognitive  
  - e.g. *sinob-u* ‘to miss’

7.3.1 The pseudo-spontaneous with a non-psychological verb

When non-psychological transitive verbs are passivized and have an inanimate theme argument, they may have spontaneous meanings. Examine the following sentence.

(11)  -(r)are with spontaneous meaning

Sir-ana-i  uti-ni kabin ga war-are-te i-ta.

know-not-Pre within vase Nm break-RARE-Prg-Pres

‘The vase was broken without my knowledge.’
Despite the presence of -(r)are rather than -e, sentence (11) denotes a spontaneous event. Compare this with the following spontaneous sentence.

(12) **Spontaneous**
    Sir-ana-i uti-ni kabin ga war-e-te i-ta.
    know-not-Pre within vase Nm break-RARE-Prg-Pres
    ‘The vase was broken without my knowledge.’

These sentences are similar not just in their component elements, but also in the meaning. Hence, they can be used interchangably to describe the same situation.

Although these sentences are unquestionably semantically similar, we will show that only (12) is spontaneous and that (11) is a passivized sentence—as its morphology suggests. The crucial difference is manifested in their ability to cooccur with a rationale clause, whose PRO subject must be controlled by an agent argument in the matrix clause.

(13) **Pseudo-spontaneous with a rationale clause**
    [PRO sikaesi o suru tame ni ] kabin ga
    revenge Ac do-Pre in-order-to vase Nm
    war-are-ta.
    break-RARE-Pst
    ‘The vase was broken for revenge.’
(14) **Spontaneous with a rationale clause**

*[PRO sikaesi o suru tame ni ] kabin ga revenge Ac do-Pre in-order-to vase Nm

\[ \text{war-e-ta.} \]

\[ \text{break-RARE-Pst} \]

'The vase broke for revenge.'

If (11) were a true spontaneous construction, (13) should not be possible since there would be no agent argument to serve as controller (just as in (14)). The grammaticality of (13) suggests that we are dealing with passive (with an implicit agent argument) rather than a genuine spontaneous structure.

Consider next the sentences in (15), from Sato (1982:286).

(15)

a. **Passive with spontaneous meaning**

Mizu ga bin ni mitas-are-te i-ru

\[ \text{water Nm bottle Lc fill-RARE-Prg-Pres} \]

'The bottle is filled with water.'

b. **Ergative**

Mizu ga bin ni miti-te i-ru

\[ \text{water Nm bottle Lc be-filled-Prg-Pres} \]

'The bottle is full of water.'

The passive predicate in (15a) consists of a transitive base (*mitas-* 'to fill') and RARE, while the predicate in (15b) is a simple ergative verb with the thematic structure [Theme]. While both sentences express a spontaneously occurring event, Sato (1982) points out that the passive form is possible only if there is the implication of some
human activity behind the event. With an event which occurs autonomously (i.e. where no human activity is involved), the passive form cannot be used, as the following sentences help illustrate.

(16)

a. **Passive with spontaneous meaning**
   
   *Hikari ga sora ni mitas-are-te i-ru.
   light Nm sky Lc fill-RARE-Prg-Pres
   ‘The sky is bright with light all over.’

b. **Ergative**
   
   Hikari ga sora ni miti-te i-ru
   light Nm sky Lc fill-Prg-Pres
   ‘The sky is bright with light all over.’

The event ‘filling the sky with light’ does not imply any human activity. Hence, sentence (16a) is unacceptable as a passive since this form is associated with an agent role. As expected, the ergative sentence in (16b) is grammatical since, as noted at the outset, it is reserved for events that occur spontaneously without the intervention of an agent.

Interestingly, the same results are obtained for the contrast between the ‘pseudo’-spontaneous and the spontaneous. If we replace kabin ‘vase’ in (11) and (12) above with hada ‘skin’, we get an event where there should be no human activity.

(17) **Passive**
   
   *Sirana-i uti-ni hada ga war-are-te i-ta.
   know-not-Pres within skin Nm crack-RARE-Prg-Pres
   ‘Without being noticed the skin was being cracked.’
(18) **Spontaneous**  
Sirana-i uti-ni hada ga war-e-te i-ta.  
know-not-Pres within skin Nm crack-RARE-Prg-Pres  
‘Without being noticed the skin had cracked.’

‘Skin’s cracking’ cannot be seen as an event under the control of an agent. Thus (17), in which -(r)are is used, is not acceptable. In contrast, the spontaneous construction in (18) (with the affix -e) is grammatical. This provides further evidence that -(r)are constructions with inanimate theme subjects are passives despite the element of spontaneity in their meaning.

7.3.2 The pseudo-spontaneous with a psychological verb

I will now turn to pseudo-spontaneous constructions involving a psychological verb. Let us keep in mind the fact that the key property of the spontaneous construction is that the external argument of the base verb is not maintained.

As noted earlier, the major difference between psychological and nonpsychological p-suffix structures is that the former class lacks the spontaneous construction. (See Table 2.2 in chapter 2.) Hence, sentence (19) is not an acceptable spontaneous. Compare it with (19').

(19) **Psychological verb with -e**  
*Haru ga mat-e-ru.  
spring Nm await-RARE-Pres  
‘The spring is expected.’
Interestingly, psychological verbs can be associated with a spontaneous-like interpretation with the help of the suffix -(r)are rather than -e. In fact, some linguists (e.g. Teramura 1982) consider sentences like (19') to be instances of the spontaneous pattern. Let me present some further examples of this sort.

**Passive of a psychological verb with spontaneous meaning**

(20) Mukasi no koto ga sinob-are-ru.
    old time Gen matter Nm miss-RARE-Pres
    ‘An old time comes into mind.’ (from Shibatani 1985:823)

(21) Mukasi no koto ga omoidas-are-ru.
    old time Gen matter Nm remember-RARE-Pre.
    ‘An old time comes into mind.’

According to Shibatani (1985), these sentences are the only genuine instances of the spontaneous construction in Japanese. However, although he associates the spontaneous with the process of detransitivization (i.e. the deletion of the agent), he does not provide any syntactic tests to show that the sentences above are agentless (or cognizerless). Moreover, contrary to what I have been claiming, Shibatani considers the -e suffix construction to be a simple intransitive clause. In fact, he does not even treat -e as a suffix. In contrast, I claim that the sentences in (20) and (21) are actually instances of the passive construction, as their morphology indicates.
If I am correct, then we would expect these sentences to exhibit passive-like properties.

Let us consider the thematic transitivity/intransitivity of the contested constructions. The first test involves the admissibility of a ni-marked NP. Recall that in the passive the external role of the base verb is present though it may not be realized, whereas in the spontaneous it is simply absent. If the verbs exemplified in (20) and (21) are spontaneous, then they should be thematically intransitive and hence unable to occur with a ni-marked phrase. However, as the sentences in (22) indicate, a ni-marked NP is acceptable with these predicates.

(22)

a. Mukasi ga wareware ni sinob-are-ru.
   old time Nm us Obl miss-RARE-Prs
   ‘An old time comes to our mind.’

b. Kodomo no koro no koto ga yoku watasi ni
   child Gen period Gen matter Nm often
   watasi ni (wa) omoidas-are-ru.
   I Obl (Top) remember-RARE-Pres

   ‘The memory from the childhood comes to my mind.’

The grammaticality of sentences (22a) and (22b), which contain a theme subject and a ni-marked cognizer (which must be first person), indicates that the sentences under consideration are thematically transitive with the thematic structure [Cognizer, Theme].
It might seem appropriate to attempt a confirmation of this finding with the familiar control test involving rationale clauses, but this is difficult to do since most passives with psychological verbs do not cooccur with a rationale clause (presumably because psychological events generally do not have rational motivations). Instead, I will use a test involving adverbial phrase orientation. Consider the following sentences. (pro represents a null genitive pronominal here.)

(23)

a. Hanako ga Taroo o [pro/*j kokoro kara] suite i-ru.
   Hanako Nm Taroo Ac heart from like-Prg-Pres
   'Hanako likes Taroo from the bottom of the heart.'

b. Taroo o Hanako ga [pro/*j kokoro kara] suite i-ru.
   Taroo Ac Hanako Nm heart from like-Prg-Pres
   'It is Taroo that Hanako likes from the bottom of the heart.'

The predicate suk-u 'like' is a psychological predicate, and hence has the thematic structure [Cognizer, Theme]. The sentences in (23) contain a postpositional phrase modifier pro kokoro kara 'from X's heart,' in which the possessive pronominal (pro) is necessarily coreferential with the verb's cognizer argument. In (23a) above, Hanako bears the cognizer role, and hence the interpretation of pro is Hanako, not Taroo, as indicated by the subscripts i and j. This is also true in (23b), in which the object NP is preposed to the initial position, where it receives a focus interpretation. Hence, neither
structural position nor focus is relevant for the interpretation of the pro in the adverbial phrase.

Crucially, however, if a sentence does not contain a cognizer argument, it is unacceptable with the adverbial phrase. Examine (24) and (25), neither of which contains a cognizer role. In the former, Ziroo bears an agent role and in the latter Hanako a theme role.

Ziroo Nm heart from letter Ac write-Pst
‘Ziroo wrote a letter from his heart.’

Hanako Nm heart from die-Pst
‘Hanako died from the heart.’

Let us now try this test with the sentences with psychological verbs and the -(r)are suffix whose status we are considering.

(26) Mukasi no koto ga [proj kokoro kara] sinob-are-ru.
old time Gen matter Nm heart from miss-RARE-Pres
‘An old time is missed from the heart.’

Sentence (26) has no overt cognizer NP, but the sentence is acceptable with the adverbial phrase pro kokoro kara ‘from x’s heart’, whose genitive pro must take an cognizer antecedent. There must therefore be an unrealized argument which bears a cognizer role in this sentence. This suggests that there is an implicit argument, as one would expect in a passive construction but not a spontaneous one.
In conclusion, though the suffix -(r)are may be used to denote spontaneity, it is not a spontaneous marker in the technical sense. The suffix -e is the sole marker for the spontaneous structure.

7.4 Analysis and syntactic representation of the spontaneous

We have argued that -e in the spontaneous is a suffix, not part of the root, and that it is the sole marker of the spontaneous. In this section, we will present our analysis of this affix.

As we stated earlier, -e can attach only to a transitive verb. This notwithstanding, it cannot be a matching suffix since the thematic structure of the base verb is not the same as that of the affixed verb as shown below. Recall that a spontaneous verb is thematically intransitive, having the thematic structure [Theme].

(27) a. Base verb: ur-u ‘sells’ [Agent, Theme]

b. Spontaneous: ur-e-ru [Theme]

Hence, I assume that the spontaneous suffix -e deletes the agent role of the base verb when the affixation takes place, and that it inherits the content of the grid.

(28) -e [ ] (Delete the agent role.)

Spontaneous constructions are like ergative clauses in terms of both their grammatical relations and their thematic valence: the verb has a Theme role, but lacks an external role. (As defined earlier, ergative verbs are intransitive with the thematic structure [Theme].)

As outlined in the previous section, there are two arguments to
support the claim that there is no agentive PP in spontaneous sentences. The first is based on the fact that the appearance of an overt agentive PP yields an unacceptable sentence.

(29) *Hon ga Ziroo ni ur-e-ru
          book Nm Ziroo Obl sell-RARE-Prs
     ‘The books sell by Ziroo.’

Since, by the Projection Principle, all syntactic representations are projections of lexical properties (thematic structure), this shows that spontaneous verbs lose their Agent role in the lexicon. Thus, the thematic structure of ur-e-ru (‘sell-RARE-Prs’) is simply [Theme].

The second argument is based on the non-occurrence of a rationale clause with a spontaneous sentence.

(30)  a. Uti ga yak-e-ta
          house Nm burn-RARE-Pst
     ‘The house burned.’

b. *[PRO hokenkin o tor-u tameni] uti ga
   insurance Ac take-Pres in-order-to house Nm
   yak-e-ta
   burn-RARE-Pst

     ‘The house burned in order to collect the insurance.’

As illustrated by (30b), a spontaneous cannot cooccur with a rationale clause. Since the PRO subject in a rationale clause requires
control by an agentive argument, this means that the spontaneous verb does not maintain the agent role of the base verb.

The following, then, is the D-structure of a spontaneous sentence.

(31)

**Lexical entry:**  
\textit{yak-} [Agent, Theme]  
\textit{-e} [ ] (Delete the external role.)

**D-Structure**

```
     IP
    /   \
   /     \
  e      I
     \
   VP
     /   \
    /     \
   e      NP
           /   \
          /     \
       uti   V
             /   \
            /     \
           V' [TH]  
             /   \
            /     \
          NP       NP
             /   /   \
            /   /     \
          e   uti  V
                /   \
               /     \
             V [TH]  
                /   \
               /     \
           yak [AG, TH]

S-structure:
[S uti ga\textsubscript{i} [VP t\textsubscript{i} yak-e-ru] ]
```

Like the other p-suffixes, the spontaneous morpheme \textit{-e} is also a phrasal and inheriting suffix. The crucial difference between it and \textit{-(r)are} is that when affixation takes place, the external role (= the
agent role) is not just dethematized but deleted. Because deletion of
the external role entails that the spontaneous verb cannot theta-
mark its logical subject, the verb also loses the ability to assign Case
to its object (by Burzio's Generalization). It is for this reason that the
NP *uti ‘house’ in (31) has to move to the subject position in order to
get Case.

As with -(r)are, the grid of the -e suffix percolates to the V'
node in D-structure, from where it licenses a theme argument.
However, due to the absence of an agent role in the grid, a ni-marked
NP is not permitted since there is no way to license it. This is
illustrated in (32), parallel to (30) above.

(32) *Uti ga Taroo ni yak-e-ta
    house Nm Taroo Obl burn-RARE-Pst
    ‘The house burned by Taroo.’

For the same reason, the spontaneous sentence cannot cooccur with a
rationale clause, as (30b) (repeated here as (33)) illustrates.

(33) *Uti ga [PRO hokenkin o tor-u tameni].
    house Nm insurance Ac take-Pre in-order-to
    yak-e-ta
    burn-RARE-Pst
    ‘The house burned in order to collect the insurance.’
7.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have drawn two conclusions about the Japanese spontaneous construction: (i) though the base verb of the spontaneous selects both an agent role and theme role, only the latter is maintained (i.e., the agent role is deleted), and (ii) -e is a suffix and the sole marker of the spontaneous construction. Especially significant for the overall thesis being developed in this dissertation is the claim that the spontaneous suffix has the function of downgrading the external theta role, which is achieved through deletion rather than the dethematization found in direct and indirect passives. We thus are able to account for both the similarities and the differences between the spontaneous and the passive: both structures involve downgrading of the external role, but they achieve this result in different ways (deletion vs dethematicization).
Notes

1. The terms 'inchoative' and 'unaccusative' are also sometimes used to refer to this construction.

2. This sentence is acceptable with the potential interpretation, i.e., '(I) was able to send a book.'

3. In (9), only ergative verbs which take only a theme argument are used as examples, but of course these are not the only type of ergative verbs. For instance, *tukamar-u ‘to be arrested’ and mitukar-u ‘to be found’ are ergatives though they may take a ni-marked argument. Interestingly, the results are the same. That is, their corresponding transitive verbs cannot be followed by -e, the spontaneous suffix. Hence:

   (i) tukamae-ru ‘arrests X’ ---- *tukamae-e-ru
   (ii) mituke-ru ‘finds X ----- *mituke-e-ru

4. Psychological verbs may occur with -e.

   omo-u ‘to think’------- omo-e-ru

   However, I don’t believe that this is an instance of spontaneous: Rather it is an instance of the potential pattern which we have not yet discussed (see chapter 9). A preliminary piece of evidence in support of this conclusion is that it can have a ni-marked NP.

   (i) Sore ga subarasi-i to omo-e-ru
   that Nm wonderful-Pres Comp think-RARE-Pres
   ‘It comes to mind that it is wonderful.’
(ii) Sore ga subarasi-i to watasi ni omo-e-ru
that Nm wonderful-Pres Comp I Lc think-RARE-Pres
'It comes to my mind that it is wonderful.'
8.1 Introduction

To this point, I have examined the passive and the spontaneous, and have argued that both involve the downgrading of the external role of the base verb. In this chapter, I will examine another p-suffix construction, the subject honorific, and try to show that it too involves the same process.

Japanese has devices to mark two types of deference: deference toward the referent of an argument of a predicate (i.e., subjects, objects, etc.), and deference toward listeners. The former is commonly called “honorification” or “exaltation,” and the latter “stylization”. Exaltation has to do with whom you are talking about, whereas stylization has to do with whom you are talking to. I will not discuss stylization further, since it seems to have no relevance to this work.

The first type of deference, exaltation, is divided into two subtypes based on the grammatical relation (subject, object, etc.) of the target of exaltation:

(i) subject honorification (the referent of the subject is the target)

When the referent of the subject is a socially superior individual other than the speaker (or his ‘in-group’), (s)he can be exalted;
(ii) object honorification (the referent of the non-subject is the target)

When the referent of a non-subject argument is a socially superior individual, other than the speaker, (s)he can be exalted.

Both subject and object honorification involve adjusting the predicate. In this chapter, however, we will deal only with subject honorifics since the -(r)are suffix that we are examining is used solely in this construction. (Recall that object honorifics were briefly discussed in a previous chapter.)

Japanese has several different ways to exalt the referent of the subject, including use of the p-suffix -(r)are. I will refer to patterns involving this suffix as RARE-honorifics.¹

(1)

a. Tanaka-sensee ga kooen made hasit-ta.
   Tanaka-Prof Nm park as-far-as run-Pst
   'Prof. Tanaka ran to the park.'

b. Tanaka-sensee ga kooen made hasir-are-ta.
   Tanaka-Prof Nm park as-far-as run-RARE-Pst.

(2)

a. Tanaka-sensee ga kono hon o yon-da
   Tanaka-Prof Nm this book Ac read-Pacific-Pst
   'Prof. Tanaka read the book.'

b. Tanaka-sensee ga kono hon o yom-are-ta.
   Tanaka-Prof Nm this book Ac read-RARE-Pst
The verb in (1) is intransitive, and the one in (2) transitive. In both of these examples, Prof. Tanaka is the person to whom the subject NP refers, and the speaker's respect for him is expressed by the affixation of -(r)are. Notice that though the suffix -(r)are is affixed to the verb, it does not appear to have any syntactic effect, that is, affixation of -(r)are causes no alternation in terms of the number of arguments or their case marking. Recall that the other p-suffixes do affect the argument structure of the base verb to which they are attached, though they differ from each other in the precise effects.

Based on the surface properties of the -(r)are honorific construction, it has traditionally been assumed that there is no syntactic difference between sentences like (1a) and (1b). What is more, traditional analyses have dissociated this construction from the passive constructions and the other p-suffix structures discussed in previous chapters.

Contrary to the traditional view, I take the position that the RARE-honorific construction shares certain syntactic properties with the other p-suffix structures and that the honorific -(r)are also has a syntactic effect on syntactic structure just as the other p-suffixes do. Hence, sentences (1a) and (1b) differ not only in the form of the predicate but also in syntactic structure.

In particular, I will claim that the suffix in the honorific pattern prevents the highest argument from moving into the specifier position of IP. Hence, it has the function of downgrading the subject of the base verb. Taken together with what we have
already observed about the other p-suffix constructions, my analysis of honorifics therefore identifies a property shared by all these structures—downgrading of the external argument.

The organization of this chapter is as follows. In the following section, some recent works on this construction will be reviewed, and the inadequacy of these analyses will be pointed out. Then, my analysis will be presented and developed.

8.2 Literature Review

In contrast to passives or potentials, there have been very few analyses for the RARE-honorifics. In this section I will review analyses from two different frameworks: (i) Whitman (1989) in GB, and (ii) Dubinsky (1985) in Relational Grammar (RG).

8.2.1 Whitman's raising analysis

Whitman (1989) claims that RARE honorifics involve subject-to-subject raising. He treats the suffix -(r)are as an independent verb which takes a whole clause as its complement. The subject (i.e., [NP, IP]) of the embedded clause is then raised into the specifier position of IP of the matrix clause. In his theory, example (1a) would therefore be analyzed as follows: (In Whitman's analysis the external role is assigned directly to the specifier of IP.)
(1a') D-Structure:
[se [s Tanaka-sensee kooen made hasir]-are-ta ]
Tanaka-Prof park as-far-as run -RARE-Pst

S-Structure:
[ s [Tanaka-sensee]]i [ s ti kooen made hasir ] -are-ta]
Tanaka-Prof park as-far-as run-RARE-Pst

Tanaka-sensee, which is the subject of the lower clause, is raised to the specifier position of IP in the matrix clause.

This analysis explains why there is no change in case marking in RARE-honorific sentences, since the honorified NP is still a subject (although now of the matrix verb). However, this cannot be the correct analysis because the suffix -(r)are does not behave like a raising verb. As illustrated by an English raising verb seem, raising verbs permit the subject of any lower predicate to be raised.

(3) a. Ergative
The door opens.
The door seems t to open.
↑\

b. Intransitive (unergative)
Mary exercises a lot.
Mary seems t to exercise a lot.
↑\

c. Transitive
Suzan reads French novels a lot.
Suzan seems t to read French novels a lot.
↑\

d. Expletive
It is cold.
It seems t to be cold.
↑\

e. Passive

The price was raised.

The price seems to have been raised.

\[ \uparrow \]

As these sentences illustrate, a raising verb permits the subject of any type of embedded predicate to be raised; it is not sensitive to the grammatical category of lower verb.

Now, keeping this fact in mind, let us examine the case of \(-{(r)are}\) in Japanese. It can be affixed to an intransitive verb as well as a transitive verb, which we already know from examples (1) and (2), repeated here as (4) and (5).

(4) Intransitive sentence without/with \(-{(r)are}\)
   a. Tanaka-sensee ga kooen made hasit-ta.
      Tanaka-Prof Nm park as-far-as run-Pst
      'Prof. Tanaka ran to the park.'
   b. Tanaka-sensee ga kooen made hasir-are-ta.
      Tanaka-Prof Nm park as-far-as run-RARE-Pst.

(5) Transitive sentence without/with \(-{(r)are}\)
   a. Tanaka-sensee ga kono hon o yon-da
      Tanaka-Prof Nm this book Ac read-Pst
      'Prof. Tanaka read the book.'
   b. Tanaka-sensee ga kono hon o yom-are-ta.
      Tanaka-Prof Nm this book Ac read-RARE-Pst

However, there are predicates with which the honorific suffix \(-{(r)are}\) cannot cooccur. Examine the following sentences.
In sentences (6) and (7), *Tanaka-sensee ‘Prof. Tanaka’, whose referent may be seen as socially superior, can be the target of the exaltation. However, neither sentence allows -(r)are as a honorific marker, as the (b) structures show. Interestingly, the verbs used here belong to the same “stative transitive” class. These verbs are transitive in the sense that they select two arguments, but unlike a regular transitive verb, both NPs are marked with the nominative case.

This indicates that RARE-honorification is sensitive to the class of the lower verb, which contradicts the known characteristics of raising verbs. Based on this, I conclude that -(r)are is not a raising verb as Whitman claims. The fact that double nominative verbs cannot cooccur with RARE-honorification is exactly what my theory predicts, as I will explain in section 8.5.
8.2.2 Dubinsky's analysis

Now let us consider Dubinsky's RG analysis. Dubinsky claims that subject honorification with the suffix -(r)are involves union. The term ‘union’ refers to a construction which is biclausal at the ‘underlying level’, but monoclausal at a later level. (See Dubinsky 1985: 337-342 for details). His crucial claim is that the suffix does not affect the grammatical relation of the arguments of the base verb.

The following syntactic representation (called a ‘relational network’) represents the grammatical relations of the constituents in the sentences we are considering.

(P = predicate, 1 = subject, and 2 = direct object)

\[(8)\]

a. Tanaka-sensee ga kono hon o yon-da.
   Tanaka-Prof Nm this book Ac read-Pst
   ‘Prof. Tanaka read this book.’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} \\
\text{yon-da T-sensee hon} \\
\text{1} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. Tanaka-sensee ga kono hon o yom-are-ta.
   Tanaka-teacher Nm this book Ac read-RARE-Pst
   ‘Prof. Tanaka read this book.’
According to (8b), the clause is transitive at the initial stratum ('underlying level'). At the next level the union predicate -(r)are is introduced putting the initial transitive predicate en chomage, but no new arguments are introduced and no grammatical relations involving a nominal are altered. Dubinsky states that "the net effect of the construction is simply to add another layer of predication." (p. 338)

Dubinsky (p. 323) refers to the honorific suffix as 'verbal inflection, which indicates deference or honorification toward the subject of a sentence'. It is not clear what he means by inflection, but it seems what he is claiming is -(r)are simply inherits the arguments of the base verb. Is this the case? Consider the following sentences.

(9) Request construction without -(r)are
   a. Tanaka-sensee, kooen made hasitte kudasai.
      Tanaka-Prof park as-far-as run give
      'Please run as far as the park, Prof. Tanaka.'

   b. Tanaka-sensee, kono hon o yonde kudasai.
      Tanaka-Prof this book Ac read give
      'Please read this book, Prof. Tanaka.'
Sentences in (9) and (10) are all so-called 'request constructions'. As can be seen, the sentences without -(r)are are grammatical, but those with the suffix are unacceptable. The natural conclusion to reach is that the difference in grammaticality between the sentences in (9) and those in (10) must be due to the presence of the suffix in the latter. If -(r)are simply inherits the arguments of the base verb, what blocks its occurrence in the request construction?

While one might argue that this contrast reflects the semantics of honorifics (i.e., honorifics are not compatible with the request construction), this is not the case. The examples in (11) and (12) show another honorific morpheme cooccurring with the request construction. (o...ni nar-u is another productive honorification pattern in Japanese.)

(11) Tanaka-sensee, kooen made o-hasiri-ni natte kudasai Tanaka-Prof park as-far-as run-SH give ‘Please run as far as the park, Prof. Tanaka.’

(12) Tanaka-sensee, kono hon o o-yomi-ni natte kudasai Tanaka-Prof this book Ac read-SH give ‘Please read this book, Prof. Tanaka.’
Hence, the semantics of honorifics cannot be the reason for the unacceptability of -(r)are in the request construction. This suggests that some syntactic factors must be at work here.

8.3 Analysis

In this section I present an account of -(r)are in the Subject Honorification construction which is compatible with my analysis of the other -(r)are constructions.

First, we will determine what kind of suffix -(r)are in Subject Honorifics is. As illustrated at the beginning of this chapter, this suffix can attach to both intransitive and transitive verbs, and all the arguments of the base verb can be lexically realized. Hence this type of -(r)are must be an inheriting suffix just like the other p-suffixes. I temporarily ignore the fact that the 'stative transitive' verbs cannot cooccur with -(r)are, which I will discuss a little later in this section.

Though it might appear that the suffix simply inherits the arguments of the base verb and has no effect on argument structure, I believe that the affixation of -(r)are has a syntactic effect. What it does is to prevent the highest NP from moving into the specifier position of IP. Hence, it has the function of downgrading the subject of the base verb just as the other p-suffixes do (see earlier chapters). (13a) and (13b) are the S-structures of (2a) and (2b), respectively.
(13a) **Sentence without -(r)are suffixation**
Tanaka-sensee ga hon o yon-da
Tanaka-Prof. Nm book Ac read-Pst

(13b) **Sentence with -(r)are suffixation**
Tanaka-sensee ga hon o yom-are-ta
Tanaka-Prof Nm book Ac read-RARE-Pst
In terms of case marking, (13a) and (13b) are alike. However, they differ in terms of where their highest argument is—i.e., in specifier of VP versus specifier of IP. One might say that the honorific construction in (13b) is a type of impersonal construction since there is no argument in the specifier position of IP of which the VP can be predicated. (Recall that according to the condition on predication briefly outlined in chapter 3, a VP must be predicated of mutually c-commanding NP in personal constructions.)

It is conceivable that by not singling out the subject argument as the target for predication, the impersonal construction allows speakers to express their deference toward the referent of that phrase. Another strategy for not singling out the referent of the subject phrase is to use the plural form. This strategy is used in French for an addressee with high status.

(14) a. Où es-tu?

where are-you (sg)

b. Où êtes-vous?

where are-you (pl)

‘Where are you?’

The analysis that I have proposed for the Japanese honorifics makes a very unexpected prediction. That is, RARE-honorification should not be possible in the embedded sentence of an obligatory control construction where PRO has an anaphoric reading, and therefore must occur as specifier of IP in S-structure so that it can be
lexically governed by the matrix verb. (Recall that there are two uses of PRO: (i) one with an arbitrary interpretation, and (ii) the other with an obligatory control interpretation. The PRO in the former use is ungoverned, but the one in the latter is governed by the matrix V and therefore must occur in specifier of IP—see section 3.2.5. in chapter 3.)

Let us see whether this prediction is correct. First, I will illustrate in which position PRO has to occur in order to be lexically governed in a control construction using English examples. Consider the following.

(15)

a. PRO remains in the specifier of VP
   *
   \[ \text{I} \text{I} \left[ \text{v} \text{p} \text{ try} \left[ \text{I} \text{P} \text{ to} \left[ \text{v} \text{p} \text{ PROi go} \right] \right] \right] \]

b. PRO moves to the specifier of IP
   \[ \text{I} \text{I} \left[ \text{v} \text{p} \text{ try} \left[ \text{I} \text{P} \text{ PROi to } \left[ \text{v} \text{p} \text{ ti go} \right] \right] \right] \]

In (15a) PRO stays in the specifier of VP, whereas in (15b) it moves to the specifier of IP. PRO in both sentences should be coreferential with I, but in the former it is not governed by the verb try because the intervening VP is not a theta-marked complement and is therefore a barrier.

(16) Barrier

All XPs are barriers unless they are theta-marked complements.
On the other hand PRO in (15b) is governed by try since IP is a theta-marked complement. Hence, only PRO in (15b) can get the obligatory control reading. That is, in a control construction PRO has to be in the specifier of IP position in order to get the anaphoric interpretation.

Returning now to Japanese honorifics, we will use honorific verbs in the embedded clause in a control construction. Under these circumstances, my theory predicts that honorific -(r)are prevents the PRO subject from moving into the specifier of IP position, contrary to what the control theory requires. The sentence should therefore be ungrammatical.

The construction involved here is the te-form + *kudasaru* pattern. *Kudasaru* 'give' is a control verb, and is used to indicate the in-coming direction of a favor, i.e., it is used when someone does a favor for the speaker. I will use the term 'favor construction' to refer to this construction.

(17)

a. *Declarative sentence with -(r)are*

\[
\text{Sensee ga (watasi ga ire-ta) otya o}
\text{Teacher Nm (I Nm pour-Pst) tea Ac}
\]

nom-are-ta.
drink-RARE-Pst

'The teacher drank the tea (that I poured)'
b. **Favor construction with -(r)are**  
*Sensee ga otya o nom-are-te kudasat-ta.  
Teacher Nm tea Ac drink-RARE give-Pst.  
‘The teacher drank the tea (for me).’

c. **Favor construction without -(r)are**  
Sensee ga otya o nonde kudasat-ta  
teacher Nm tea Ac drink gave-Pst.  
‘The teacher drank the tea (for me).’

Sentence (17a) illustrates that RARE-honorification is possible with *nom- ‘to drink’, a transitive verb, in the declarative form. However, as (17b) illustrates, when the same verb is used in the te-form kudasa-ru construction, -(r)are honorification is unacceptable. Note that without -(r)are suffixation the sentence is grammatical, as (17c) indicates. The same contrasts are found with intransitive verbs.

(18)

a. **Declarative sentence with -(r)are**  
*Sensee ga watakusi to aruk-are-ta.  
Teacher Nm I wi th walk-RARE-Pst  
The teacher walked with me.

b. **Favor construction with -(r)are**  
*Sensee ga watakusi to aruk-are-te kudasat-ta.  
teacher Nm I with walk-RARE-te give-Pst.  
‘The teacher walked with me (for me).’

c. **Favor construction without -(r)are**  
*Sensee ga watakusi to aruite kudasat-ta.  
teacher Nm I with walk give-Pst.  
‘The teacher walked with me (for me)’
These sentences indicate that the suffixation of -(r)are is the cause of ungrammaticality in the control construction. If what the suffix -(r)are does is prevent the NP from moving into the specifier position of IP, this difference in acceptability is explainable. The following structures, corresponding to sentences (17b) and (17c), will help illustrate my point.

(19) Favor construction with -(r)are

*Sensee ga otya o nom-are-te kudasat-ta.
teacher Nm tea Ac drink-RARE- give-Pst
'The teacher drank the tea for me.'

\[
[\text{Sensee ga } [\text{IP e } [\text{VP PRO otya o nom-are-te }] ] \text{ kudasat-ta}]
\]

![Diagram of the structure](image-url)
In (20), PRO is in the specifier position of IP, whereas in (19) it remains in the specifier of VP because of the -(r)are suffix. As illustrated with the English examples above, the PRO in (19) is not governed because there is a VP barrier. Hence it cannot be controlled by its antecedent sensee, and the sentence is unacceptable.

Furthermore, this is another argument against Whitman's raising verb analysis. If -(r)are is a raising verb, the structures for (17b) and (17c) would be (21) and (22), respectively.
(21) **Favor construction without -(r)are**

\[
\text{teacher Nm tea Ac drink give-Pst}
\]

'\text{The teacher drank the tea for me.}'

(22) **Favor construction with -(r)are**

\[
\text{teacher Nm tea Ac drink -RARE}
\]

'\text{The teacher (hon) drank the tea for me.}'

In both sentences, PRO is in the identical [NP, IP] position, and nothing intervenes between the controller and PRO. Hence, his theory predicts that both sentences should be grammatical. However, as we already know, this is not the case.

8.4 The unacceptability of RARE-honorifics with a stative transitive verb

In this section I will present an explanation for why "stative transitive" verbs do not allow RARE-honorification. Recall that the two arguments of such verbs are both marked with the nominative case. (Of course, with a regular transitive verb, one argument bears the nominative case and the other the accusative.)

(23) **Stative Transitive verbs**

a. **Without -(r)are**

\[
\text{Tanaka-sensee ga eego ga deki-ru.}
\]

\[
\text{Tanaka-teacher Nm English Nm can-do-Pre}
\]

'\text{Prof. Tanaka can speak English.}'}
b. With -(r)are

*Tanaka-sensee ga eego ga deki-rare-ru.
Tanaka-teacher Nm English Nm can-do-RARE-Pre
'Prof. Tanaka (hon) can speak English.'

I believe that both arguments of stative transitive verbs are internal, and there is no external argument. According to this analysis, the following is the D-structure of (23a).

(24) D-structure

```
IP
  NP  I
    e
   VP
     I
    NP  V' Pres
       e
       NP  V'
          Tanaka-sensee
          NP  V
             eego  deki-ru
```

Following Burzio's generalization, I assume that the verb deki-ru 'can do' selects no external role, and consequently no objective case is available. Hence, the two NPs, Tanaka-sensee 'Prof. Tanaka' and eego 'English' will be Caseless if they stay where they are. The only way for them to get Case is to move to where it is available. There are two such positions: [NP, VP] (specifier of VP) and [NP, IP] (specifier of
The crucial thing about these verbs, then, is that two NPs need to find a position in which they can receive Case. In other words, the [NP, IP] and [NP, VP] positions must be open in order to receive the moved arguments. This in turn explains why this construction does not allow RARE-honorification. Recall that the function of the honorific suffix -(r)are is to prevent the highest NP in D-structure from moving into the specifier of IP. This means that this position won't be available as a landing site for movement. Let us consider the consequences of this with the help of the following tree, which is the D-structure of (23b).
There are two NPs without Case in this structure, but there is only one position where Case is available (the specifier of VP) since -(r)are blocks movement to the specifier of IP position. Whether the first NP or the second NP moves into this position, there is one NP left without Case. Hence, the sentence is unacceptable.

Before concluding this section, I would like to make a point about RARE honorification in nominal predicates whose case marking pattern is very similar to that of the stative transitive verbs just discussed.

(27)
a. Tanaka-sensee ga eego ga (o)zyoozu-da.
   Tanaka-teacher Nm English Nm good-at-Pres
   ‘Prof. Tanaka is good at English’
b. Tanaka-sensee ga eego ga (o)zyoozu-de ar-u.

Tanaka-teacher Nm English Nm good-at exist-Pres

‘Prof. Tanaka is good at English.’

As (27a) indicates, zyoozu-da ‘to be good at’ like deki-ru ‘can do’ and ir-u ‘to need’ selects two arguments, both of which are marked with the nominative marker. As it is, -(r)are cannot be attached to the nominal predicate zyoozu-da ‘to be good at’ for this suffix can be added only to verbs. However, the nominal predicate pattern may be followed by the verb ar-u ‘to exist’, which creates a form to which -(r)are can be affixed. Interestingly, the resulting sentence is acceptable, as (28) indicates. (This was pointed out to me by John Haig.)

(28) Tanaka-sensee ga eego ga (o)zyoozu-de ar-are-ru.

Tanaka-Prof Nm English Nm skillful exit-RARE-Pres

‘Prof.Tanaka is good at English.’

Why is the affixation possible here while the other stative transitive verbs do not allow it? I will show below that sentence (28) contains two separate predicates: zyoodu da ‘be skillful’ and ar-u ‘to exist’. This is why RARE honorification is possible in this pattern.

In Japanese, when lexically derived predicates (e.g. the causative) are conjoined, all their component elements have to be kept together. Thus, (30a) is acceptable as the conjunction of the
causative sentences in (29), but not (30b) since the causative suffix -(s)ase is missing from the first clause.

(29) Taroo ga Hanako o nak-ase-ta.
Taroo Nm Hanako Ac cry-Caus-Pst
'Taroo made Hanako cry.'

Jiroo ga Hiroko o nak-ase-ta.
Jiroo Nm Hiroko Ac cry-Caus-Pst
'Jiroo made Hiroko cry.'

(30) **Conjunction of causative sentences**

a. Taroo ga Hanako o nak-ase, Jiroo ga Hiroko o
   Taroo Nm Hanako Ac cry-Caus Jiroo Nm Hiroko Ac

   nak-ase-ta.
cry-Cause-Pst

   'Taroo made Hanako cry and Jiroo made Hiroko cry.'

b. *Taroo ga Hanako o naki/(naite) Jiroo ga
   Taroo Nm Hanako Ac cry Jiroo Nm

   Hiroko o nak-ase-ta
   Hiroko Ac cry-Cause-Pst

If the sequence of a nominal predicate and the verb *ar-u* ‘to exist’ is a single unit at the syntactic level, then we should obtain the same result for the causative pattern. However, as (31b) below indicates, the nominal predicate can occur by itself without the verb *ar-u* ‘to exist’ in the first clause of a coordinate structure.
(31)

a. Mito-san ga ongaku ga (o)suki-de ar-ru
Mito-Mr. Nm music Nm like exist
'Mr. Mito likes music.'

Mito-san ga tenisu ga (o)zyoozu-de ar-u
Mito-Mr. Nm tennis Nm good-at exist
'Mr. Mito is good at tennis.'

b. Mito-san ga ongaku ga (o)suki-de, tenisu ga
Mito-Mr. Nm music Nm like tennis Nm

(o)zyoozu-de ar-u.
good-at exist-Pres

'Mr. Mito likes music and good at tennis.'

Hence, the sequence consisting of a nominal predicate and ar-u 'to exist' should be analyzed as two separate elements.

Now I will show below why RARE honorification is possible with the sequence of a nominal predicate and ar-u 'to exist'. Let us assume that ar-u 'to exist' takes a whole VP as its complement.
(32) **Structure of nominal predicate + ar-u**

Tanaka-san ga eego ga (o)zyoozu-de ar-u
Tanaka-Mr. Nm English Nm skillful exit-Pre
'Mr.Tanaka is good at English.'
(33) **Structure of nominal predicate + ar-u with -(r)are**

Tanaka-san ga eego ga (o)zyoozu-de ar-are-ru

Tanaka-Mr Nm English Nm skillful exit-RARE-Pres

‘Mr. Tanaka is good at English.’

Even after -(r)are is affixed, there are two positions to which the NP arguments of the verb can move to receive Case: the spec of VP position in the higher clause and the comparable position in the lower clause. Hence, the sentence is acceptable.

8.5 Summary and conclusion

In this chapter, we examined the RARE-honorific p-suffix construction. While it has traditionally been claimed that this use of honorific -(r)are has no effect on syntactic structure, I have shown here that this is not correct. As demonstrated by the obligatory control pattern discussed above, honorific -(r)are prevents the
highest NP from moving into the specifier of IP. Thus, this suffix also has the function of downgrading which is shared by the other p-suffixes.
Notes

1. Some also use the term 'honorific passives'.
2. The chomeur relation is borne by an element whose grammatical relation in the immediately preceding stratum has been subsumed by another element. In the example under consideration, the base verb is a chomeur because the suffix -(r)are has subsumed the predicate relation previously borne by yom- ‘to read’.
CHAPTER 9
The potential

9.1 Introduction

Thus far, I have examined three p-suffix constructions: the passive, the spontaneous and the honorific. I have argued that although the way in which each of the p-suffixes affects the argument structure of the base verb differs, they share the same syntactic function: downgrading of the external argument of the base verb. In passives, this argument is dethematized; in the spontaneous, it is deleted; and in honorifics, it is linked to a syntactically less prominent position. In this chapter, I will examine the last p-suffix structure, the potential, and try to associate it with yet another way of downgrading the external argument of the base verb.

Unfortunately some parts of my analysis have not yet been worked out in detail. Moreover, I have not found strong arguments to support the proposals that I do make. I must therefore leave a more careful analysis of potentials for further studies.

9.2 Two types of potentials

As mentioned in the introduction, there are two types of potentials: (i) the passive potential, which corresponds roughly to the -able construction in English, and (ii) the active potential, which expresses one’s ability to do something.
(1) **Passive Potential**

a. Kono kinoko ga tabe-rare-ru
   this mushroom Nm eat-RARE-Pre
   ‘These mushrooms are eatable.’

b. Koko no mizu ga nom-e-ru.
   here Gen water Nm drink-RARE-Pre
   ‘The water of this place is drinkable.’

(2) **Active Potential**

a. Taroo ga sasimi ga tabe-rare-na-i
   Taroo Nm sashimi Nm eat-RARE-Neg-Pre
   ‘Taroo cannot eat sashimi.’

b. Taroo ga sake ga sukosi nom-e-ru
   Taroo Nm sake Nm a little drink-RARE-Pre
   ‘Taroo can drink sake a little.’

The morpheme used in the potential has two allomorphs: *-rare* and *-e*. The former is affixed to a verb whose stem ends with a vowel, and the latter to one ending in a consonant. Hence, *tabe-* ‘to eat’ in (1a) and (2a) is followed by *-rare*, whereas *nom-* ‘to drink’ in (1b) and (2b) occurs with *-e*.

Turning now to the difference between the two types of potentials illustrated in (1) and (2), note that while the active potential includes two arguments, the passive potential has only one. Despite this difference, I will argue that these two types of potentials are the same construction in that the syntactic effect of the suffix is the same in both potentials. I will begin by discussing the active potential.
9.3 Active Potential

I will start my discussion by outlining three unique properties of active potentials which will be relevant to my subsequent analysis.

9.3.1 Case marking alternations

A first property of the active potential has to do with its unique and peculiar case marking patterns. When the predicate is a transitive verb in Japanese, there are two NPs in the sentence: one marked with the nominative particle *ga* and the other with the accusative particle *o*.

(3) **Active sentence with a transitive verb**

| Nm | Ac      |
|----------------|
| Taroo                      |
| English     | speak-Pres |
| *‘Taroo speaks English.’* |

However, when a potential is built upon a transitive verb, the two NP arguments are not necessarily marked with the same case used in a regular transitive sentence. Examine the following.

(4) **Case patterns in the active potential**

a. **ga - ga pattern**

| Nm | Ac      |
|----------------|
| Taroo                      |
| English     | speak-RARE-Pre |
| *‘Taroo can speak English.’* |
b. *ni-ga pattern*
Taroo ni eego ga hanas-e-ru
Taroo Dat English Nm speak-RARE-Pres
'Taroo can speak English.'

c. *ga-o pattern*
Taroo ga eego o hanas-e-ru
Taroo Nm English Ac speak-RARE-Pres
'Taroo can speak English.'

As the translations indicate, the 'core meaning' of all three sentences is the same. But each has a unique case pattern: the leftmost NP (henceforth 'the first NP') can be marked either with the nominative or dative case while the second NP can occur with either the nominative or accusative marker. However, if the first NP takes the dative case, then the second NP has to be marked with the nominative case; it cannot occur with the accusative case marker. Thus, (5) below is unacceptable.

(5) *ni-o pattern*
*Taroo ni eego o hanas-e-ru.
Taroo Dat English Ac speak-RARE-Pre
'Taroo can speak English.'

These case alternations have been a persistent topic of debate among researchers studying the active potential. A particular focus has been the grammatical function of the NPs in each of those patterns. In particular, linguists have questioned whether the *ni*-marked NP can be the subject and which of the two NPs in the *ga-ga* pattern is the subject. Since answers to these questions depend on
theory-internal assumptions, I will not go into this matter in this dissertation. But I would like to point out here that, regardless of Case marking, it is the first NP that exhibits subject properties, and therefore occurs in the specifier of IP position. I will present two arguments to support this. (See Takezawa 1987 for other arguments.)

The first argument involves reflexives. As discussed in chapter four, the antecedent of the reflexive is not necessarily the subject of a sentence. However, it is true that if a nominal is the subject, it should be able to antecede a reflexive. The following sentences show that only the first NP in the active potential sentence can serve as the antecedent of reflexive.

(6) Taroo ni (wa) okusan ga zibuni/*j no tomodati no mae de homer-are-ru kana.
Taroo Lc (Top) wife Nm self Gen friend Gen front Lc praise-RARE-Pres wonder.

'I wonder if Taroo can praise his wife in front of self’s friends.'

(7) Taroo ga sono hitoj ga zibuni/*j no kyooodai no yoo-ni ais-e-na-i (koto)
Taroo Nm that person Nm self Gen brother Pos manner love-RARE-Neg-Pres

'Taroo cannot love that person like self’s brothers.'
Both NPs in these sentences are [+human], so the second NP should be able to antecede *zibun* ‘self’ if it is the subject. However, as these examples illustrate, this is not possible.

It should be noted here that it is subjecthood rather than sentence-initial position that determines the referent of reflexive. Consider the following examples.

(8)

a. Tarooj ga Saburooj o zibun|j no heya de seme-ta.
   Taroo Nm Saburoo Ac self Gen room Lc blame-Pst
   ‘Taroo blamed Saburoo in self’s room.’

b. Saburooj o Tarooj ga zibun|j no heya de seme-ta.
   Saburoo Ac Taroo Nm self Gen room Lc blame-Pst
   ‘Taroo blamed Saburoo in self’s room.’

(8b) is a transitive clause in which the subject is not sentence-initial. If the surface word order determined the referent of reflexive, we would expect *Saburoo* to be the antecedent. However, *zibun* is in fact coreferential with *Taroo*, the subject.

The second subject property associated with the first NP in active potentials involves the control of the null subject in *-nagara* constructions. The suffix *-nagara* ‘while/although’ is attached to a predicate to form a subjectless subordinate clause. When it is suffixed to a stative verb, including an adjective or a nominal predicate, the clause has a ‘concessive’ sense and *-nagara* is usually glossed as ‘although’.
(9) Bokusi de-ari-nagara, Tanaka-san ga Yamada-san o pastor be-exit-though Tanaka-Mr. Nm Yamasa-Mr. Ac
damasi-ta.
decieve-Pst

‘Even though he is a pastor, Mr. Tanaka deceived Mr. Yamada.’

On the other hand, when it is attached to a non-stative verb, the clause implies ‘concurrent’ action, and -nagara is glossed as ‘while’.

(10) Terebi o mi-nagara, Taroo ga ootoo o TV Ac watch-while Taroo Nm younger brother Ac
sikat-ta
scold-Pst

‘While watching TV, Taroo scolded his brother.’

What interests us here is the controller of the null pronominal subject in the -nagara clause. It is clear from the above examples that the subject in the matrix sentence can be the controller. But it is not clear from these examples whether the controller should be the surface subject or the logical subject since the same NP fulfills both roles. However, this issue can be resolved by passivizing the matrix clause in the above sentences.
(11) *Nagara* construction with passive matrix clause

proi/*j bokusi de-ari-nagara, Yamada-sanj ga

paster be-exit-though Yamada-Mr. Nm

Tanaka-sanj ni damas-are-ta.
Tanaka-Mr. Obl deceive-RARE-Pst

‘Mr. Yamada; was deceived by Mr. Tanaka even though he/*j
is a pastor.’

(12) proi/*j terebi o mi-nagara, otootoi ga

TV Ac watch-while, younger brother Nm

titiN Obl sikar-are-ta.
father Obl scold-RARE-Pst

‘The brotheri was scolded by the father while hei was watching
TV.’

We can infer from these examples that it is the surface subject rather
than the logical subject (here the demoted agent) which is the
controller of the null pronominal in the -*nagara* clause.

We can now apply this test to the active potential to determine
whether the first NP is the subject or not. Observe the following
examples:

(13) Concessive -*nagara* clause with a potential sentence

[proi Nihonzin de ari-nagara] Tarooi ga/ni nihongo ga

Japanese be-though Taroo Nm/Lc Japanese Nm

amari yoku hanas-e-na-i (koto).
not-very well speak-RARE-Neg-Pres

‘Taroo cannot speak Japanese very well though he is a Japanese.’
Concurrent -nagara clause with a potential sentence

[proj ne-nagara] Taroo ga/ni soba ga tabe-rare-ru
lie-while Taroo Nm/Lc noodle Nm eat-RARE-Pres
'Taroo can eat noodle while lying down.'

In both the concessive and the concurrent type of -nagara clauses, the first NP (Taroo) is the controller of the null subject. Even when it is [+human], the second NP cannot serve in this capacity, as the following sentence shows.

(15) proi*/j ne-nagara Taroo ni Ichiroo ga
lie-while Taroo Lc Ichiroo Nm
hatak-e-ru (kana).
hit-RARE-Pres (I wonder)
'(I wonder) if Taroo can hit Ichiroo while lying down.'

Thus, the pro in (15) can be only coreferential with Taroo, not with Ichiroo.

In summary, both the reflexive and control tests indicate that regardless of case marking the first NP in the active potential is the subject, and therefore occurs in the specifier position of IP in S-structure.

9.3.2 Selectional Restrictions

A second property of active potentials that I want to discuss has to do with selectional restrictions. As mentioned in chapter 2, the active potential normally does not take an inanimate nominal as
the possessor of the ability. The verb or-u ‘to break’, for instance, can take either an animate or inanimate nominal as its subject.

(16)

a. Taroo ga kaede no eda o zenbu otte simat-ta
   Taroo Nm maple Gen branch Ac all break finish-pst
   ‘Taroo broke all the branches of the maple tree.’

b. (Kinoo no) kaze ga kaede no eda o zenbu
   (Yesterday Pos) wind Nm maple Gen branch Ac all
   otte simat-ta.
   break finish-Pst
   ‘(Yesterday’s) wind broke all the branches of the maple tree.’

However, once the potential suffix is attached, the sentence with an inanimate nominal is no longer acceptable.

(17)

a. Potential with an animate NP
   Taroo ga/ni ano kaede no eda ga
   Taroo Nm/Dat that maple Gen branch Nm
   or-e-ru (kasira)
   break-RARE-Pres (wonder)
   ‘I wonder if Taroo can break the branches of that maple tree.’
b. Potential with an inanimate NP

*Kaze ga/ni ano kaede no eda ga
wind Nm/Dat that maple Gen branch Nm

or-e-ru (kasira).
break-RARE-Pres (wonder)

'(I wonder if) the wind can break the branches of that maple tree.'

Thus (17a), with an animate nominal, is acceptable, but (17b), with an inanimate nominal, is not.

9.3.3 Cooccurrence Restrictions

A third property of active potentials has to do with cooccurrence restrictions, i.e., the kinds of verbs that can be the base for the potential suffix. Unlike the spontaneous suffix -e, which can be attached only to a transitive verb, the passive suffix -(r)are does not have such a restriction. The active potential suffix behaves like its counterpart in the passive: it can occur not only with transitive verbs, as in (3) and (4) above, but also with other types of verbs.

(18) Active potential with an intransitive verb

Sono kodomo ga moo aruk-e-ru
that child Nm already walk-RARE-Pre
'That child can walk already.'

(19) Active potential with a ditransitive verb

Mary ga kodomo ni eego ga osie-rare-ru.
Mary Nm children Dat English Nm teach-RARE-Pre
'Mary can teach English to the children.'
Although the active potential can be formed from verbs with various types of complements, this does not mean that it can occur with any verb at all. In particular, it cannot be built from a verb which does not select an agentive argument. Consider the following examples.

(20) **Verb without an agentive argument**

a. Taroo ga gityoo ni kimar-u.
   Taroo Nm chairman Dat is-decided-Pres
   'Taroo will be decided on as the chairman.'

b. Taroo ga sono koto ni gakkarisi-ta.
   Taroo Nm that matter at disappointed-Pst
   'Taroo was disappointed by that matter.'

(21) **Active potential formed from a verb without an agentive argument**

a. *Taroo ga gityoo ni kimar-e-ru
   Taroo Nm chairman Dat is-decided-RARE-Pres
   'Taroo can be decided on as a chairman.'

b. *Taroo ga sono koto ni gakkari-deki-ru
   Taroo Nm that matter at disappointed-can-do-Pres
   'Taroo can be disappointed by that matter.'

*(deki-ru 'can do' is a potential form of suru 'do').*

*Kimar-u 'to be decided' and gakkari-suru 'to be disappointed' do not select an agentive argument. Hence, the potential suffix cannot be affixed to them, as illustrated by the unacceptability of (21a) and (21b). The following pair of sentences provides an even subtler illustration of this point.*
These two sentences differ only in the choice of base verb. Although \textit{ais-u} ‘to love’ and \textit{suk-u} ‘to be fond of’ have very similar meanings, they differ in the theta role of their external arguments. Whereas the verb \textit{ais-u} ‘to love’ selects an agent role, \textit{suk-u} ‘to be fond of’ does not. But this difference is so crucial that only the first of these sentences is acceptable.

Having discussed three properties of the active potential, I will now introduce my analysis of this construction.

9.4 Analysis of active potentials

The number of the arguments of the base verb remains the same in the active potential. Hence, if it is formed from an intransitive verb, there is one argument; if the base verb is transitive, there are two arguments; and so on. But it is clear from the different case marking patterns discussed above that the potential suffix must affect the argument structure of the base verb in some way. The question is how it does this.
Up to this point we have seen that p-suffixes downgrade the external role of the base verb in three different ways: dethematization, deletion, and "demotion" (i.e., association with a syntactically less prominent position). Does the potential suffix have one of these functions? I propose that it has its own way of downgrading, namely that it "suppresses" the external role of the base verb by coindexing it with another role in the theta grid. (This type of downgrading, sometimes called lexical binding, has been independently proposed by Grimshaw (1990) and Kiparsky (1987) for reflexive constructions in Romance.)

This brings us to the question of which role the agent role is coindexed with in the active potential. Active potentials formed from intransitive base verbs are especially problematic since there is no visible second argument to coindex the agent with. To circumvent this problem, I propose that in the Japanese potential the agent role is "suppressed" through coindexing with the experiencer role that the base verb optionally selects. In other words, the agent role is invariably coreferential with the experiencer argument in active potential constructions.

Recall that when we discussed the indirect passive construction, we argued that a verb may select an experiencer role which cannot be realized in the active sentence due to the lack of Case. Consider, for instance, an active sentence like (24) below, which is unacceptable.
(24) *Kodomo ga Taroo ni/o nak-u
child Nm Taroo Dat/Ac cry-Pst
'The child cries on Taroo.'

S-structure

```
(201)

(25) Taroo ga kodomo ni nak-are-ru
Taroo Nm child Obl cry-RARE-Pres
'Taroo got cried on by the child.'

Taro0, the experiencer argument in this sentence, cannot receive Case in its complement position since the verb nak- 'to cry' does not have Case to assign. Moreover, there are no positions to which it can move since the specifier of VP is a theta position to which the agent role is assigned. The only way around this problem is to dissociate the external role from the specifier of VP so that its argument loses the status of being the highest argument. Hence, it gives the experiencer argument a chance to move into the specifier of IP. Recall that according to the condition on predication discussed in chapter 3 the highest argument moves into the specifier of IP position. The affixation of the passive suffix achieves this result.
The external role is dethematized and is associated with the postpositional phrase *kodomo ni* 'by child', and it does not move into the specifier of IP.

In the case of the potential, the effect of the affixation is very similar to what happens in indirect passives. Because the agent role of the base verb is coindexed with the experiencer and is thus suppressed, it is no longer associated with the specifier position of VP. Let us illustrate this using the following structure. (The AG role is in parentheses to indicate that it is suppressed.)

(26) Kodomo ga aruk-e-ru
    child Nm walk-RARE-Pres
    'The child can walk.'
The verb *aruk-* ‘to walk’ selects an agent role and an experiencer role. When the potential suffix is affixed, the agent role is coindexed with the experiencer role and is suppressed in accordance with Kiparsky and Grimshaw’s suggestion that lexically bound arguments are not realized.

The experiencer argument *kodomo* ‘child’ cannot receive Case if it stays in the position it occupies in (26). But because of the suppression of the agent role, there are two positions to which it can move: the specifier of IP and the specifier of VP. I assume that due to the predication condition, it moves to the specifier of IP position, as (27) below illustrates. Hence, the sentence is acceptable.
This analysis of potentials captures the fact that the person who carries out the action is the same as the one who has the ability. One might wonder whether the experiencer role in indirect passives is the same role as the one in active potentials. In the former structure, it denotes an affectee whereas, in the later, the possessor of ability. But in both cases the experiencer is an animate, nonagentive argument corresponding to a 'locus' of sorts, i.e., in indirect passives it is the locus of affectedness whereas in potentials it is the locus of potentiality. For this reason, I assume that the same role is found in both patterns.

9.4.1 Arguments for the non-presence of the agent role

I will show in this section that the agentive role is in fact missing from the grid of active potentials, consistent with my suggestion that lexical binding leads to its suppression. The argument involves the hortative construction.
In Japanese most verbs can be turned into a hortative form to express an invitation or a proposal with the meaning ‘let’s do it’ or ‘let me do it’. The hortative morpheme has two allomorphs: -yoo for vowel bases and -oo for consonant bases.

(28)
  a. Vowel-final base verb in the hortative form
     Tabe-yoo.
     eat-hortative
     ‘Let’s eat.’
  b. Consonant-ending base verb in the hortative form
     Nom-oo.
     drink-hortative
     ‘Let’s drink.’

But if the verb does not select an agentive role, the hortative form is not possible. Thus, the examples in (29) below are unacceptable.

(29) Agentless verbs in the hortative from
     disappointed-hortative
     ‘Let’s get disappointed.’
  b. *Taroo o suk-oo
     Taroo Ac like-hortative
     ‘Let’s like Taroo.’

Recall that the first NP in the active potential is the subject at S-structure, and that the construction can be built only from a verb with an agentive role as its external argument. If the potential suffix simply inherits the theta-roles of the base verb, then the potential predicate should have an agent role in its grid. If this is so, it should
be able to occur in the hortative form. Consider the following examples.

(30) **Active potential in the hortative form**

*Sasimi ga tabe-rare-yoo.
Sashimi Nm eat-RARE-hortative
‘Let’s be able to eat sashimi.’

*Sake ga nom-e-yoo.
sake Nm drink-RARE-hortative
‘Let’s be able to drink sake.’

As can be seen, it is not possible for potential predicates to cooccur with a hortative morpheme. This indicates that the agent role of the base verb has not been maintained in the grid, consistent with my proposal that lexical binding has led to its suppression.

9.4.1.1 Refutation of counter examples

It has been pointed out that the contexts in which the *ga-o* pattern occurs are not the same as for the *ga-ga* one (Inoue 1984, Sugioka 1986 etc). The former occurs in context where the ability is under volitional control whereas the latter occurs only in contexts where the ability is simply intrinsic to its possessor. Compare the following pairs of sentences. (These are taken from Inoue 1984)
(31)  
a. Katoo-san ga doitugo o/*ga hanas-e-ru  
Kato-Mr. Nm German Ac/Nm speak-RARE-Pres  
yoo-ni watasi wa doituzin no kyaku mo yon-da.  
manner I Top German Gen guest also invite-Pst  
'I invited some Germans as guests in order that Mr. Kato could  
speak German.'

b. Amerika ni nagaku ite, nihongo o hanas-u  
America Lc long stay Japanese Ac speak-Pres  
kikai ga sukunai node, nihongo ga/??o  
chance Nm few as Japanese Nm/(Ac)  
hanas-e-naku nat-ta.  
speak-RARE-Neg become-Pst  
'As I stayed in America too long and have had few chances to  
speak Japanese, I became unable to speak it.'

(32)  
a. Taroo ga tyuugaku o de-ru mae-ni  
Taroo Nm junior high Ac leave-Pres before  
mootuaruto o/*ga hik-e-ru yoo-ni si-ta.  
Mozart Ac /Nm play-RARE manner do-Pst'  
'Before graduating from junior high school, Taro tried to  
become able to play Mozart.'

b. Sidai ni Taroo ga mootuaruto ga (*o) hik-e-ru yoo ni  
gradually Taroo Nm Mozart Nm (Ac) play-RARE-Pres manner  
nat-ta  
become-Pst  
'Taroo gradually reached the point where he could play  
Mozart.'
In the (a) sentences in (31) and (32), the potential occurs with ..*yoo ni suru* ‘to make an effort to..’ and hence has a strong volitional connotation. In the (b) sentences, in contrast, the potential is used with a non-volitional inchoative predicate. As the placement of the asterisks shows, the *ga-o* pattern, but not the *ga-ga* pattern, is acceptable in the former context.

Based on this, Inoue (1984) claims that the agent role is retained in the *ga-o* pattern (p.30), and that this is why there is a strong agentive reading. However, this cannot be right since the fact that a sentence can occur in a volitional context does not necessarily indicate that there is an agentive role in the grid. Consider the following examples.

(33) *Watasi wa yasai ga hayaku ni-e-ru yoo-ni s-i-ta,*
i Top vegetable Nm quickly cook-RARE-Pres
manner do-Pst

‘I made an effort so that vegetables cook quickly.’

(34) *Taro ga hootyoo ga yoku kir-e-ru yoo-ni s-i-ta,*
Taro Nm knife Nm well cut-RARE-Pres
manner do-Pst

‘Taro made an effort for the knife to cut well.’

The verbs *ni-e-ru* ‘something cooks’ and *kir-e-ru* ‘something cuts’ in the embedded clause in these examples are spontaneous forms.
Recall that we showed in chapter seven that spontaneous verbs do not have an agent role in their grid. But the sentences above are all acceptable even though they occur in the same volitional context found in Inoue's (1984) examples. Hence, the strong agentive interpretation must be due to the matrix predicate \( yoo \text{ ni suru} \) 'to make an effort to' and has nothing to do with the potential predicate in the embedded sentence. This allows us to maintain our hypothesis that the agent is suppressed in potential construction.

9.4.2 Case marking Patterns

In this section I will discuss how the treatment of potentials that I have proposed accounts for two of the three case marking patterns found in these structures. (I have no proposal to make about the \( ga-o \) pattern at this time.)

Before introducing my account, I will discuss a common view among Japanese linguists (e.g. Kageyama 1982, Shibatani 1977/78, Kuno 1973). According to this view the existence of competing case marking patterns reflects a very superficial formal variation. They assume that the \( ga-o \) pattern is basic, and that if verbs bear the lexical feature [+stative], a special rule converts \( o \) on the second NP to \( ga \) (e.g. Kuno 1973), resulting in the \( ga-ga \) pattern. This rule may subsequently be followed by optional conversion of \( ga \) on the first NP to \( ni \), resulting in the \( ni-ga \) pattern. (Henceforth I refer to this view as Case conversion analysis.)
As discussed in 8.2, the conversion of \textit{ga} to \textit{ni} on the first NP is not possible when the second NP is marked with \textit{o}. The linguists mentioned above account for this by assuming that there is a general principle which requires every sentence to have one nominative marked NP (Shibatani 1978). However, this principle cannot be correct, for there are sentences without a nominative marked NP.

(35) \textit{Ano kaisya de sono syoohin o utte i-ru}  
That company \textit{Lc} that merchandise \textit{Ac} sell-Prg-Pres  
'That company is selling that merchandise.'

(36) \textit{Kootyoo-sensee kara seeto ni sono koto}  
Principal-teacher from student Dat that matter  
ni-tuite hanasi-ta.  
about speak-Pst  
'The principle spoke to the student about that matter.'

Note that these sentences do not have any missing arguments and hence are not examples of ellipsis. As noted, these sentences do not have a nominative marked NP; yet they are acceptable. I will point out more problems with Case conversion analysis later.

Contrary to the view just outlined, I take the position that the different case marking found in the active potential is due to syntactic factors. I will begin with my account of the \textit{ga-ga} pattern.
Case Assignment in the *ga-ga* pattern

My analysis of potentials explains why the potential with a transitive verb exhibits the double nominative case marking pattern. Consider a potential sentence like (37).

(37) Taroo ga eego ga hanas-e-ru
    Taroo Nm English Nm speak-RARE-Pres
    'Taroo can speak English.'

D-structure

In this sentence the agent role is suppressed (i.e. the external role of the base verb is not associated with the specifier of VP) and the potential predicate loses the ability to assign accusative Case by Burzio’s generalization. As a result, we end up with two NPs without Case (*Taroo* and *eego ‘English*) if they stay in their current positions. However, there are two open Case positions to which they can move: the specifier of IP and the specifier of VP. (This is exactly parallel the case of stative transitive verbs discussed in the honorific chapter.) Hence, the highest argument *Taroo* moves to the specifier
of IP position (satisfying the predication condition), and the theme argument eego ‘English’ moves into the specifier of VP. Both therefore receive nominative Case, giving the ga-ga pattern.

Case Assignment of the ni-ga pattern

Now I will present my account of the ni-ga pattern. I will first argue that ni-marking on the first NP is licensed by the potential suffix. I take the view that ni-marking is an instance of inherent Case, i.e., Case that is assigned in the lexical entry to an argument bearing a specified thematic role. Since the experiencer can occur with ni only when the potential suffix is present, it seems plausible to assume that -rare carries the following stipulation.

(38) Inherent Case marking: Optionally attach ni to the experiencer argument of the base verb.

The presence of ni-marking on the first NP is not simply due to the stativity of potentials, for there are derived as well as non-derived stative verbs which do not allow this suffix.

(39) Non-derived stative verb
Taroo ga/*ni okane ga ir-u²
Taroo Nm /Lc money Nm ned-Pres
‘Taroo needs money.’
(40) **Derived stative verb**  
Taroo ga/*ni sasimi ga tabe-ta-i  
Taroo Nm/Lc sashimi Nm eat-Desirative-Pres  
'Taroo wants to eat sashimi.'

The *ni*-marking is also not conditioned by the presence of *ga* on the second NP, as the Case conversion analysis claims (Kuno 1973). As reported by McGloin (1980), a potential which is built from an intransitive verb allows *ni*-marking when accompanied by a discourse-anaphoric expression.

(41) **Potential with a discourse-anaphoric expression**  
\[\text{a. Taroo ni sonna-ni hayaku oyog-e-na-i} \]
\[\text{Taroo Lc that quickly swim-RARE-Neg-Pres} \]
\[\text{'Taroo cannot swim that quickly.'} \]

\[\text{b. Taroo ni sonna-ni wa hasir-e-na-i} \]
\[\text{Taroo Lc that-much Top run-RARE-Neg-Pres} \]
\[\text{'It is impossible for Taroo to run that much.'} \]

Since the base verbs in these examples are all intransitive verbs, there is no second NP to which the nominative Case can be assigned. Yet, these sentences are acceptable with *ni* on the first NP.

In conclusion, the presence of the nominative marked NP cannot be the condition for *ni*-marking in active potentials. It should be clear from the data above that it is the potential suffix that licenses this marking just as the passive -*(r)are* licenses the oblique case marking on the dethematized external argument.
I propose that the *ni-ga* potential pattern has a structure very similar to that of the *ga-ga* pattern. The difference is that in the former the suffix licenses the *ni*-marking for the first NP.

(42) Taroo ni eego ga hanas-e-ru
Taroo  Lc  English  Nm speak-RARE-Pres
'Taroo can speak English.'

D-structure

```
  IP
    NP  
      e
    VP
      Pres  
        V' [AGi(=0), EXi, TH]
        PP
          Taroo ni NP  
            e
          eego  
        hanas-e-ru
```

The potential suffix suppresses the agent role, and the verb consequently loses the ability to assign Case to the theme argument *eego* 'English'. The highest argument (*Taroo*) moves into the specifier of IP, leaving one Case position available for *Eego* 'English'—the specifier of VP position.
9.5 Passive Potentials

In contrast with the active potential, the passive potential is normally formed only from a transitive verb. The two patterns also differ in terms of the number of "realized" arguments when they are built from a transitive verb (as discussed in section 9.1), and in terms of the choice of the "possessor" of the ability/potentiality. To see the first difference, compare examples (43) and (44).

(43) **Passive potential**

Kono sakana ga tabe-rare-ru.
this fish Nm eat-RARE-Pres
'This fish is eatable.'

(44) **Active potential**

Taroo ga sakana ga tabe-rare-na-i
Taroo Nm fish Nm eat-RARE-Neg-Pres
'Taroo cannot eat fish.'

Both potentials are built upon the same transitive verb *tabe*- ‘to eat’, but while there are two NPs (*Taroo* and *sakana* ‘fish’) in the active potential, the passive potential has only one NP (*kono sakana* ‘this fish’).

Turning to the second difference, the active potential identifies a specific person as possessor of the ability/potentiality, which is why a definite noun (*Taroo*) is used (44). In the passive potential, in contrast, there is no phonetically realized nominal denoting the possessor, which is therefore interpreted as an unspecified person (roughly equivalent to English *anyone*). Hence, the interpretation of (43) is that the fish can be eaten by anyone.
Is this another case of an implicit argument? The answer is 'no', for this unmentioned "argument" always has an arbitrary interpretation, which is uncharacteristic of implicit arguments. Recall that the implicit argument in both the direct passive and the object honorification construction (chapter 6) has a non-arbitrary referent.

(45) **Direct Passive with an implicit argument**
Kono tatemono wa asita torikowas-are-ru.
This building Top tomorrow abolish-RARE-Pres
'This building will be abolished tomorrow.'

This sentence implies that the abolishing was done by a particular (unknown) person or persons (corresponding to English 'someone' rather than 'anyone'). Hence, the referent of the implicit argument in direct passive has to be a specific person. Turning to the object honorific construction, consider the following sentence.

(46) **Object honorific sentence with an implicit argument**
Watasi ga otya o o-nomi-si-ta
I Nm tea Ac drink-OH-Pst
'I drank tea.'

The object honorific predicate is used to exalt a socially superior person, corresponding to an implicit argument in this sentence. Crucially, though, we have to have a specific individual in mind; otherwise it is not possible to use this construction. Hence, the referent of the implicit argument in this sentence cannot be arbitrary either.
In conclusion, the unmentioned possessor in the passive potential is not an implicit argument. I assume that it is an arbitrary PRO that occurs in a complement position in D-structure. In the next section I will introduce my analysis of passive potential in more detail.

9.4.1 Analysis of passive potential

I propose that the function of the suffix used in the passive potential is the same as the one used in the active potential. That is, it suppresses the base verb’s external role, which is coindexed with the experiencer role in the same grid (consistent with the lexical binding analysis outlined above). The difference between the two types of potentials is due to the type of nominal corresponding to the possessor of the ability (the experiencer). Whereas the active potential chooses a phonetically realized nominal, the passive potential chooses an arbitrary PRO.

(47) Kono sakana ga tabe-rare-ru
     This fish Nm eat-RARE-Pres
     ‘This fish is eatable.’
The PRO moves to the specifier of IP position, and *kiono sakana* 'this fish' moves to the specifier of VP position, where it can receive nominative Case.
Evidence for the claim that the PRO is in the specifier of IP position in S-structure comes from the nagara clause test. Recall that the controller of the null pronominal in the nagara clause is the surface subject.

(48) \([\text{pro}_i \ huransugo \ no \ terebi \ o \ mi-nagara}], \)
French Gen TV Ac watch-while

PRO\(_i\) huransugo ga manab-e-ru (kana)
French Nm learn-RARE-Pres (wonder)

'French is learnable while watching TV, (I wonder).

As the coindexing shows, the PRO is the controller of the null subject in the nagara clause. Hence, it must be the surface subject and in the specifier of IP position.

9.6 Summary

In this chapter, I examined the last of the Japanese p-suffix constructions—the active and passive potential patterns. Although my analysis here has been somewhat speculative, I have attempted to show that these two patterns are instances of the same construction and that the suffix signals the suppression of the base verb's external role following coindexing with its experiencer role (lexical binding). Thus, the potential suffix also has the function of downgrading which is shared by the other p-suffixes.
Notes

1. In transformational analyses, this fact has been captured by having a biclausal structure.

2. It has been pointed out to me by John Haig that the verb *ir-u* 'to need' allows the ni-marking on the first argument in a certain context.

   Watasi ni okane ga ir-u no wa toozen-desu (yo).
   *I need money that Top expected.*

   'It is expected that I need money.'
CHAPTER 10

Summary and conclusion

The central thesis of this dissertation has been that the various Japanese constructions that make use of p-suffixes (-{r)are and its cognates) can be unified in accordance with Johns' (1992) proposal, repeated here from Chapter 1.

(1) Where morphemes are identical or similar in phonological properties, in the unmarked case, they are identical or similar in all lexical properties.

Using Roeper's affixation theory, I examined five constructions: the direct passive, indirect passive, spontaneous, subject honorific, and potential. I argued that each of the p-suffixes used in these structures downgrades the external role of the base verb in its own unique way. A brief summary of each construction follows, focusing on the function of the suffix.

In direct and indirect passives, the suffix has the function of dethematization, i.e. dissociation of the external role of the base verb from the specifier of VP. The difference between direct and indirect passives is that in the latter the base verb selects an experiencer role whereas in the former it does not. The following D-structures help illustrate this. (Italics are used to indicate the part of a tree structure which is formed in the lexicon.)
(2) The direct passive
Ken ga Taroo ni nagur-are-ta
Ken Nm Taroo Obl hit-RARE-Pst
'Ken was hit by Taroo.'

nagur-u 'to hit': [Agent, Theme]
-(r)are downgrades the external role by delinking it from the specifier of VP.

(3) The indirect passive
Taroo ga kodomo ni nak-are-ta
Taroo Nm child obl cry-RARE-Pst
'The child cried on Taroo.'
nak-u 'to cry': [Agent, Experiencer]
-(r)are downgrades the external role by delinking it from the specifier of VP.
For the spontaneous, I proposed that the suffix deletes the external role rather than simply dethematizing it. The following structure was posited.

(4) The spontaneous
    Hon ga ur-e-ru
    book Nm sell-RARE-Pres
    'The book sells (well).'

*ur-u* 'to sell': [Agent. Theme]

*e* deletes the external role.
For the subject honorific, the suffix changes a personal structure into impersonal one; i.e., it prevents the external role from moving into the syntactically prominent specifier of IP position. The following is the structure posited.

(5) The subject honorific
Tanaka-sensee ga hasir-are-ta.
Tanaka-Prof Nm run-RARE-Pst
‘Prof. Tanaka ran.’

*hasir-u* 'to run': [Agent]

*(r)are* prevents the external role from moving into the specifier of IP position.
Finally, for the potential p-suffix construction, I proposed that the external role is suppressed following coindexing with a coreferential experiencer argument of the base verb.

(6) The potential

\begin{align*}
\text{Kodomo ga aruk-e-ru} \\
\text{child Nm walk-RARE-Pst} \\
\text{‘The child can walk.’}
\end{align*}

\textit{aruk-u} ‘to walk’: [Agent, Experiencer]

\textit{-(r)are} suppresses the external role of the base verb.
In conclusion, the p-suffixes of Japanese may well have a common pragmatic function of 'agent defocusing', as Shibatani (1985) suggested. However, I have argued in this dissertation that their formal similarity is syntactically motivated; i.e., they all downgrade the external role of the base verb by preventing its association with the syntactically prominent specifier of IP position. Hopefully, this proposal can contribute in some way to our understanding of the Japanese language.
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