

## Japanese Passives: Some Implications for the Semantics of Agentive Predicates

HOSHI, Hiroto

Akita University

### 1. Introduction

Three instances of Japanese passive are given below:

- (1) a. John-ga Mary-ni hihans –are -ta.  
John-Nom Mary -Dat criticize-Pass-Pst  
‘John<sub>i</sub> was affected by Mary’s criticizing him<sub>i</sub>.’
- b. John-ga Mary-ni nikki-o yom-are -ta.  
John-Nom Mary-Dat diary-Acc read-Pass-Pst  
‘John was affected by Mary’s reading pro’s diary.’
- c. John-ga musume-ni sin-are -ta.  
John-Nom daughter-Dat die-Pass-Pst  
‘John was affected by pro’s daughter’s dying.’

By proposing the generative grammatical analysis in (2a-c) for Japanese passives (1a-c),

- (2) a. [<sub>S1</sub> John<sub>i</sub>-ga [<sub>S2</sub> Mary-ni John<sub>i</sub>-o hihans]  
↓  
complement object deletion  
[v are]-ta] (for 1a)
- b. [<sub>S1</sub> John-ga [<sub>S2</sub> Mary-ni nikki-o yom] [v are]-ta]  
(for 1b)
- c. [<sub>S1</sub> John-ga [<sub>S2</sub> musume-ni sin] [v are]-ta]  
(for 1c)

Kuroda (1965, 1979, 1985, 1992, etc.) argues that the Japanese passive morpheme *-(r)are* in (1a-c) is a verb, and that the passive predicate *-(r)are* has the broad meaning of the English verb *affect*, yielding the interpretation that the event described by the embedded clause *S<sub>2</sub>* has an influence on the subject of the matrix clause *S<sub>1</sub>*, or *S<sub>2</sub>* brings about a change in the subject of *S<sub>1</sub>* (see Kuroda 1992, p. 5; see Kuno 1983, 1986 for an alternative proposal for the meaning of the Japanese passive morpheme *-(r)are*.) Observe that in (2a), the matrix subject and the embedded object are identical, and thus, the embedded object *John-o* is deleted under complement object deletion operation. Neither in (2b) nor in (2c), there is such identity, and there is no deletion operation involved. Observe further that the embedded subjects, *Mary* in (2a-b) and *musume* ‘daughter’ in (2c), are all marked by the Dative Case

marker *-ni*. All instances of Japanese passive of this type are thus called *-ni* passive.

On the other hand, for the following type of Japanese passive,

- (3) John-ga Mary-ni yotte hihans –are -ta.  
John-Nom Mary-by criticize-Pass-Pst  
‘John was criticized by Mary.’

Kuroda (1979, 1985, 1992, etc.) proposes the NP movement analysis like the one below:

- (4) [<sub>S</sub> John<sub>i</sub>-ga Mary-ni yotte *t<sub>i</sub>* [<sub>V</sub> hihans]-are-ta]  
↑  
NP movement

Under Kuroda’s analysis, the Japanese passive morpheme *-(r)are* of this type is not a verb, but a suffix like *-en/-ed* in English (cf. *-(r)are* in 2a-c). The suffix *-(r)are* in (4) presumably absorbs Case and suppresses the external argument of the attached verb *hihans* ‘criticize,’ triggering the NP movement of *John*, i.e. the internal argument of the attached verb *hihans* ‘criticize,’ as illustrated above (cf. Chomsky 1981, Saito 1982, etc.) Notice that in (3/4), the external argument of the attached verb, *Mary*, is marked by *-ni yotte*, not the Dative marker *-ni* (cf. 1a-c & 2a-c). Hence, the Japanese passive of this type is called *-ni yotte* passive in contrast with *-ni* passive in (1a-c)/(2a-c).

In this paper, I focus on examining the nature of *-ni yotte* passives such as (3), and explore some implications for the semantics of Japanese verbs. To do so, in the following section, I demonstrate that there is good evidence for Kuroda’s NP movement analysis of *-ni yotte* passive. The argument there heavily relies on Saito (1982). In Section 3, however, I show Kuno’s (1983, 1986) counterexamples to Kuroda’s NP movement analysis of *-ni yotte* passive, together with Kuno’s alternative analysis. In Section 4, I show that Kuno analysis of Japanese passive is not free from a problem, either. In Section 5, I suggest tentatively a way to defend Kuroda’s NP movement analysis of *-ni yotte* passive, and explore its implications for the semantics of verbs in Japanese (cf. Alsina 1992, etc.) In Section 6, I conclude the discussion of this paper.

## 2. Evidence for Kuroda's NP Movement Analysis of Japanese Passive

Kuroda's NP movement analysis of *-ni yotte* passive implies that the passive morpheme *-(r)are* in (4) is an 'intransitivizer.' This is because under Kuroda's analysis, *-(r)are* of *-ni yotte* passive is a suffix which probably absorbs Objective Case from an attached verb, turning an attached transitive verb into an intransitive one. Importantly, Saito (1982) discovers good evidence that this is indeed the case. (Saito (1982), in fact, examines the nature of *-ni* passives in Japanese, but does not discuss the properties of *-ni yotte* passive. Below, to show that *-ni yotte* passive morpheme *-(r)are* is an intransitivizer, I adopt, basically as it is, Saito's argument that *-ni* passive morpheme *-(r)are* is an intransitivizer.)

To see that *-ni yotte* passive morpheme *-(r)are* is an intransitivizer, let us first examine the nature of Japanese causatives in (5).

- (5) a. John-ga Mary-ni /-o [<sub>VI</sub> hasir]-ase -ta.  
John-Nom Mary-Dat/-Acc run -Cause-Pst  
'John let/made Mary run.'
- b. John-ga Mary -ni / -\*o hon-o  
John-Nom Mary-Dat/\*-Acc book-Acc
- [<sub>VT</sub> yom]-ase -ta.  
read-Cause-Pst  
'John let/made Mary read a book.'
- (Kuroda 1965, 1978, Harada 1973, Shibatani 1973)

Observe that two instances of Japanese causative, (5a) and (5b), indicate that if the Japanese causative verb *-(s)ase* attaches to intransitive verbs such as *hasir* 'run,' the causee argument, *Mary* in (5a), can be marked by either the Dative marker *-ni* or the Accusative Case marker *-o*. If, on the other hand, the causative morpheme *-(s)ase* attaches to transitive verbs such as *yom* 'read,' the causee argument, *Mary* in (5b), cannot be marked by the Accusative Case marker *-o*, but must be marked by the Dative marker *-ni*.

Now, keeping this transitivity-related generalization concerning Japanese causative in mind, let us consider Saito's crucial examples in (6a-b).

- (6) a. [<sub>S1</sub> John-ga Mary-ni [<sub>S2</sub> damatte Tom-ni  
John -Nom Mary-Dat silently Tom-by
- yotte [<sub>V</sub> nagur-are]] -sase -ta]  
punch -Pass -Cause-Pst  
'John let/made Mary be punched by Tom  
without saying anything.'
- b. [<sub>S1</sub> John-ga Mary-o [<sub>S2</sub> damatte Tom-ni  
John -Nom Mary-Acc silently Tom-by

yotte [<sub>V</sub> nagur-are]] -sase -ta]  
punch -Pass -Cause-Pst  
'John let/made Mary be punched by Tom  
without saying anything.'

(cf. Saito 1982, p. 92)

Observe that in (6a-b), *-ni yotte* passive is embedded inside Japanese causative. Observe further that in (6a-b), the transitive verb *nagur* 'punch' is first attached by the *-ni yotte* passive morpheme *-(r)are*, forming the passive verb [<sub>V</sub> *nagur-are*]. Then, the passive verb [<sub>V</sub> *nagur-are*] as a whole is attached by the causative morpheme *-(s)ase* in (6a-b). Significantly, the Japanese passive-causative examples in (6a-b) show that the causee argument *Mary* can be marked not only with the Dative marker *-ni* (see 6a), but also with the Accusative Case marker *-o* (see 6b). This implies that in (6a-b), the *-ni yotte* passive morpheme *-(r)are* presumably absorbs Case from the transitive verb [<sub>VT</sub> *nagur*], turning the transitive verb [<sub>VT</sub> *nagur*] into the intransitive predicate [<sub>VI</sub> *nagur-are*]. Consequently, the *-ni yotte* passive verb [<sub>V</sub> *nagur-are*] in (6a-b), as a whole, functions like intransitive verbs such as [<sub>VI</sub> *hasir*] 'run' (see 5a), but it does not function as transitive verbs like [<sub>VT</sub> *yom*] 'read' in (5b).

This is exactly what Kuroda's NP movement analysis of *-ni yotte* passive in (4) predicts, because under his NP movement analysis, the *-ni yotte* passive morpheme *-(r)are* is a suffix which probably absorbs Objective Case from an attached transitive verb, turning the transitive verb into an intransitive one. The well-formedness of (6b) with the Accusative Case marked causee *Mary-o* thus constitutes good evidence for Kuroda's NP movement analysis of Japanese *-ni yotte* passive (see 3 & 4).

## 3. Kuno's (1983, 1986) Alternative Analysis of Japanese passive

As illustrated in Kuroda's (1979, 1985, 1992) NP movement analysis of *-ni yotte* passive in (4) repeated here as (7),

- (7) [<sub>S</sub> John<sub>i</sub>-ga Mary-ni yotte *t<sub>i</sub>* [<sub>V</sub> hihans]-are-ta]  
↑ \_\_\_\_\_ |  
NP movement  
(= 4)

the internal argument of the transitive verb [<sub>VT</sub> *hihans*], i.e. *John* in (7), is forced to undergo NP movement, becoming the Nominative Case marked passive subject. The analysis in (7) thus indicates that the Nominative Case marked subject of *-ni yotte* passive must be semantically an internal argument of a *-ni yotte* passivized verb, i.e. that only a verb with an internal argument can be *-ni yotte* passivized in Japanese. Japanese *-ni yotte* passive thus parallels English passive in this respect (cf. Chomsky 1981, Saito 1982, etc.)

Kuno (1983, 1986), however, argues that there are a number of well-formed *-ni yotte* passives where the passive subject cannot be an internal argument of a *-ni yotte* passivized verb, and thus, Kuroda's obligatory NP movement analysis of *-ni yotte* passive cannot be correct. One of Kuno's (1986) counterexamples is given in (8).

- (8) Yamada-syatyoo<sub>i</sub> -ga kyoosoo -aite-no  
Yamada-president-Nom competitor -Gen
- kaisya -ni yotte  
company-by
- [*e<sub>i</sub>* tesio-ni kakete sodate ageteki-ta] Tanaka-  
with affection take care of -Pst Tanaka-  
senmu -o hikinuk -are -ta.  
executive director-Acc head-hunt-Pass-Pst  
'(Lit.) President Yamada was head-hunted  
Executive Director Tanaka, who *e<sub>i</sub>* took care of  
with affection, by a competing company.'  
(Kuno 1986, p. 75)

According to Kuno (1986), the active counterpart of *-ni yotte* passive (8) should be (9), and examples such as (9) poses a potential problem for Kuroda's NP movement analysis.

- (9) Kyoosoo-aite-no kaisya -ga  
competitor -Gen company-Nom
- [Yamada-syatyoo -ga tesio-ni kakete sodate  
Yamada -president-Nom with affection take  
ageteki-ta] Tanaka-senmu -o  
careof -Pst Tanaka-Executive Director-Acc  
hikinui -ta.  
head-hunt-Pst  
'A competing company head-hunted Executive  
Director Tanaka, who President Yamada took  
care of with affection.'  
(Kuno 1986, p. 75)

This is so, because in (9), *Yamada-syatyoo* 'Yamada-president' is not an internal argument of the verb *hikinuk* 'head-hunt,' but is the subject of the relative clause modifying the relative head *Tanaka-senmu* 'Tanaka-executive director.' (8) cannot be derived from (9) by means of NP movement, because such NP movement out of a relative clause is prohibited (Ross 1967), and Kuroda's NP movement analysis does not seem to be able account for the well-formedness of (8).

Another *-ni yotte* passive sentence which Kuno (1986) presents as a counterexample to Kuroda's NP movement analysis is given in (10). Kuno's original

example is simplified in (10) for ease of exposition.

- (10) Yamada-butyoo -ga zyuugyooiin-zenin-ni  
Yamada -manager-Nom employee -all -by  
yotte kaisya -tookyoku-ni taisite  
company-authority -toward  
sutoraiki-o ketugi-kekkoo -s -are -ta.  
strike -Acc decide-carry out -Pass-Pst  
'(Lit.) Mr. Yamada was decided and carried out  
a strike toward the company by all employees.'  
(Kuno 1986, p. 76)

By showing *-ni yotte* passive sentence (10), Kuno (1986) claims that there is no semantically and formally appropriate active counterpart of (10) where the passive subject is an internal argument of the *-ni yotte* passivized verb, *ketugi-kekkoo-s* 'decide and carry out.' Thus, the well-formedness of *-ni yotte* passive sentences such as (10) also provides a potential problem for Kuroda's (1979, 1992) obligatory NP movement analysis of *-ni yotte* passive.

Based on this type of observation, Kuno (1983, 1986) argues that we should account for the nature of *-ni* passive and *-ni yotte* passive in Japanese formally in a uniform manner, basically in line with Kuroda's generative grammatical analysis of *-ni* passive given in (2a-c). A simplified version of Kuno's analysis is given in (11a-c). (Kuno (1983, 1986) attempts to account for the differences between *-ni* passive and *-ni yotte* passive in functional terms.)

- (11)a. [<sub>S1</sub> John<sub>i</sub>-ga [<sub>S2</sub> Mary-ni yotte *e<sub>i</sub>* hihans]  
  
           'involve/affect' relation established formally  
           [v are]-ta] (for 3; cf. 4/7)
- b. [<sub>S1</sub> Yamada-syatyoo-ga [<sub>S2</sub> kyoosoo-aite-no  
kaisya-ni yotte [tesio-ni kakete sodate agete  
kita] Tanaka-senmu-o hikinuk] [v are]-ta]  
(for 8)
- c. [<sub>S1</sub> Yamada-butyoo-ga [<sub>S2</sub> zyuugyooiin-zenin-ni  
yotte kaisya-tookyoku-ni taisite sutoraiki-o  
ketugi-kekkoo-s] [v are]-ta] (for 10)

As illustrated in (11a-c), Kuno analyzes the *-ni yotte* passive morpheme *-(r)are* as a matrix verb which selects *S<sub>2</sub>* as an embedded clause (cf. Kuroda's analysis of *-ni* passive in (2a-c)). According to Kuno (1983, 1986), the passive predicate *-(r)are* has the meaning of the English verb *involve*, yielding the interpretation that the subject of the matrix clause *S<sub>1</sub>* is drawn in as an associate or participant in the event described by the embedded clause *S<sub>2</sub>*. (Kuroda's (1979, 1992) semantic notion 'affect' and Kuno's (1983, 1986) 'involve' are

quite similar in some respects, but they are not the same. In this paper, however, I put aside some subtle differences just for ease of discussion. The reader is referred to Kuroda (1979, 1985, 1992) and Kuno (1983, 1986) for a detailed discussion of their semantic analyses of the Japanese passive predicate *-(r)are*.)

In (11a), the *-ni yotte* passive subject *John* is formally co-indexed with the embedded empty object. This formal relation directly helps us interpret how the *-ni yotte* passive subject *John* is *involved* or *affected* in the event described by the embedded clause  $S_2$  in (11a). In (11b-c), on the other hand, there is no formal ‘*involve*’/‘*affect*’ relation between the *-ni yotte* passive subject and any element within the embedded clause  $S_2$ . Kuno (1983), however, argues that given the meaning of the embedded clause  $S_2$  in (11b-c), it is possible for us to infer that *Yamada-syatyoo* ‘Yamada-president’ in (11b) and *Yamada-butyoo* ‘Yamada-manager’ in (11c) are *involved* or *affected* in some way in the event described by the embedded clause  $S_2$ . Accordingly, (11a-c) are all interpreted properly, and thus, Japanese *-ni yotte* passive examples such as (3), (8) and (10) are all correctly predicted to be acceptable by Kuno’s (1983, 1986) analysis.

As independent evidence for his analysis of Japanese passive, Kuno (1986) shows contrasts like the one below:

- (12)a. Nihon-ga sihonka -tati-ni yotte utokusii  
Japan-Nom capitalist-pl. -by beautiful  
  
sizen -o hakais -are -te i-ru.  
nature-Acc destroy-Pass- -Pres  
‘(Lit.) Japan has been destroyed its beautiful  
nature by capitalists.’  
(Kuroda 1979, p. 215)

- b. \*Nihon-ga aru gaikokuzin-ni yotte utokusii  
Japan -Nom a foreigner -by beautiful  
  
zyosei -to kekkon-s-are -ta.  
woman-with marry -Pass-Pst  
(Kuno 1986, p. 78)

(12a) is acceptable, while (12b) is unacceptable.

Under Kuno (1983, 1986) analysis, (12a) and (12b) are assigned the following structures (cf. 11a-c):

- (13)a. [ $S_1$  nihon-ga [ $S_2$  sihonka-tati-ni yotte utokusii  
sizen-o hakai-s] [ $V$  are]-te i-ru].  
  
b. [ $S_1$  nihon-ga [ $S_2$  aru gaikokuzin-ni yotte utokusii  
zyosei-to kekkon-s] [ $V$  are]-ta]

In neither (13a) nor (13b), there is any formal ‘*involve*’/‘*affect*’ relation established between the matrix subject *nihon* ‘Japan’ and an element inside the

embedded clause  $S_2$ . There is, however, an important difference between (13a) and (13b). That is, given (13a), we can naturally infer that Japan is *involved* or *affected* in the event where capitalists destroyed its beautiful nature. In a sense, if capitalists destroyed Japan’s beautiful nature, they must have *affected*, i.e. *destroyed*, Japan. On the other hand, in (13b), such pragmatic inference is impossible between the passive matrix subject *nihon* ‘Japan’ and the event described by the embedded clause  $S_2$ . This is so, because the event where a foreigner married a beautiful woman cannot *affect* or *involve* Japan in any way. In short, Kuno accounts for the contrast between (12a/13a) and (12b/13b) not by formal relations (see 11a), but by means of pragmatic inference.

#### 4. Problems for Kuno’s (1983, 1986) Alternative Analysis

Kuno’s (1983, 1986) analysis of Japanese passive seems to account for the acceptability of (3), (8), (10), and (12a-b) in a desirable way. It is, however, not entirely clear how it accounts for the nature of the passive-causative construction in (6b), repeated here as (14).

- (14) [ $S_1$  John-ga Mary-o [ $S_2$  damatte Tom-ni yotte  
John-Nom Mary-Acc silently Tom-by  
[ $V$  nagur-are]] -sase -ta]  
punch-Pass -Cause-Pst  
‘John let/made Mary be punched by Tom  
without saying anything.’ (= 6b)  
(cf. Saito 1982, p. 92)

Recall that the passive-causative construction in (14) is well-formed and that the causee argument *Mary* is marked by the Accusative Case marker *-o* in (14). This implies that *-ni yotte* passive predicate [ $V$  *nagur-are*] as a whole functions as intransitive verbs such as [ $V_T$  *hasir*] ‘run’ in (5a), and that [ $V$  *nagur-are*] does not function as transitive verbs such as [ $V_I$  *yom*] ‘read’ in (5b).

Under Kuno’s analysis of Japanese passive, the passive morpheme *-(r)are* is just a matrix verb as shown in (11a-c), and it is not obvious why the transitive verb together with the *-ni yotte* passive morpheme, i.e. [ $V$  *nagur-are*], functions as an intransitive verb or lacks Accusative Case (see the contrast between (5a) and (5b).) Under Kuroda’s obligatory NP movement analysis of *-ni yotte* passive, however, the acceptability of (14) is straightforwardly accounted for. This is because on Kuroda’s analysis, the transitive verb [ $V_T$  *nagur*] ‘punch’ is first attached by the *-ni yotte* passive morpheme *-(r)are*. The *-ni yotte* passive morpheme then probably absorbs Objective Case from [ $V_T$  *nagur*], turning the transitive verb into an intransitive verb. Thus, the passive predicate [ $V$  *nagur-are*] as a whole necessarily functions as intransitive verbs such as [ $V_I$

*hasir*] ‘run,’ when it is combined with the causative verb *–(s)ase*. In other words, the intransitivization of the transitive verb *nagur* by the *–ni yotte* passive morpheme *–(r)are* licenses the Accusative Case marked causee *Mary-o* in (14).

Furthermore, the unacceptability of the following example appears to pose a potential problem for Kuno’s analysis of Japanese passive.

- (15) \*Yamada-ga ame-ni yotte hur-are -ta.  
 Yamada-Nom rain-by fall-Pass-Pst  
 ‘(Lit.) Yamada was fallen by rain.’  
 (Kuno 1986, p. 83)

Kuno (1986) assigns structure like the one below to *–ni yotte* passive (15).

- (16) [<sub>S1</sub> Yamada-ga [<sub>S2</sub> ame-ni yotte hur] [<sub>V</sub> are]-ta]

In (16), there is no formal ‘*involve/affect*’ relation established between the passive subject *Yamada* and any element within the embedded clause *S2*. However, it seems that it is possible for us to infer the situation where the passive subject, i.e. *Yamada*, gets wet after rain, i.e. *Yamada* is *affected* by the ‘rain-falling’ event. If this is the case, this type of pragmatic inference should help us interpret representation (16) without any problem (see Kuno’s inferential analysis of 11b-c and 13a). The unacceptability of (15), however, implies that pragmatic inference cannot help us interpret representation (16) properly. A question thus arises as to why inference helps us to interpret (11b-c) and (13a), but it cannot help us for (16).

On the other hand, the unacceptability of (15) is not a problem for Kuroda’s obligatory NP movement analysis of *–ni yotte* passive in Japanese, either. This is because on Kuroda’s analysis, the *–ni yotte* passive morpheme *–(r)are* must trigger intransitivization. However, the predicate [<sub>V</sub> *hur*] is an intransitive verb, and it is impossible to trigger intransitivization to such an intransitive verb. Hence, (15/16) is ruled out by Kuroda’s NP movement analysis, as desired.

## 5. Implications for the Semantics of Japanese Verbs: Hidden/Implicit Object

In the previous sections, I have shown that with respect to the treatment of *–ni yotte* passive, Kuroda’s (1979, 1985, 1992) NP movement analysis and Kuno’s (1983, 1986) bi-clausal analysis both suffer from a drawback in one way or another. Thus, we may want to attempt to develop Kuroda’s analysis by suggesting a novel way to account for the nature of Kuno’s counterexamples such as (8), (10), (12a-b), etc. Alternatively, we may try to improve Kuno’s analysis by discovering a way to explain the nature of examples such as (6b/14) and (15). We of course do not know a priori which one of these two approaches is a correct

one. Below, I attempt to suggest tentatively a way to save Kuroda’s (1979, 1985, 1992) NP movement analysis of *–ni yotte* passive in Japanese.

Remember that for Kuroda (1979, 1985, 1992), the *–ni yotte* passive morpheme *–(r)are* is an intransitivizer, which obligatorily turns a transitive verb into an intransitive one, triggering reordering transformation, i.e. NP movement. Hence, as Kuno (1983, 1986) points out that under Kuroda’s (1979, 1985, 1992) analysis, the passive subject of well-formed *–ni yotte* passives such as (8), (10), and (12a-b) must be the internal argument in the active counterparts of the examples.

Given this, here, I wish to suggest the following active counterpart for *–ni yotte* passive (8):

- (17) \*Kyoosoo-aite-no kaisya -ga  
 competitor -Gen company-Nom

**Yamada- syatyooi -Ø** [<sub>e<sub>i</sub></sub> tesio-ni kakete  
**Yamada- president-Ø** with affection

sodate ageteki-ta]  
 take care of -Pst

Tanaka-senmu -o hikinui -ta.  
 Tanaka-Executive Director-Acc head-hunt-Pst  
 (for 8)

‘(Lit.) A competing company *acted on and affected* President Yamada<sub>i</sub> by head-hunting Executive Director Tanaka, who he<sub>i</sub> took care of with affection.’

That is, what I would like to suggest with (17) is a possibility that an agentive predicate in Japanese can have an extra internal argument, i.e. a ‘hidden’ or ‘implicit’ object, which the agent of a verb ‘*acts on and affects*’ by carrying out the action described by the verb phrase. Hence, the literal translation of (17) is ‘a competing company *acted on and affected* President Yamada<sub>i</sub> by head-hunting Executive Director Tanaka, who he<sub>i</sub> took care of with affection.’ There is, however, no way for the hidden object, *Yamada-syatyoo* ‘Yamada-president,’ to receive Case in (17), and the active sentence (17) is unacceptable for Case reasons. In other words, I claim that an agentive predicate in Japanese may take a hidden/implicit object, but the predicate lacks Case for it. (The hidden/implicit object analysis suggested here seems to be plausible, given the semantics of agentive predicates. Alsina (1992) also proposes that a causative predicate, one type of an agentive predicate, in some languages selects an *affectee* internal argument. The reader is referred to Alsina (1992) for evidence for his proposal.)

Notice, however, that given (17) as a possible initial structure, *–ni yotte* passive sentence (8) can be derived successfully, as shown in (18).

- (18) Yamada-syatyoo<sub>i</sub> -ga kyoosoo-aite-no  
 ↑ \_\_\_\_\_  
 NP movement  
 kaisya-ni yotte  $t_i$  [  $e_i$  tesio-ni kakete sodate  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 ageteki-ta] Tanaka-senmu-o hikinuk-are-ta.

This is because the *-ni yotte* passivized subject, *Yamada-syatyoo* ‘Yamada-president,’ can be marked by the Nominative Case marker *-ga* in the subject position after NP movement in (18), as desired. Note here that under my suggestion in this section, the *-ni yotte* passive morpheme *-(r)are* must be an intransitivizer, but cannot be an absorber of Accusative Case (cf. Chomsky 1981, Saito 1982, etc.) An agentive verb in Japanese lacks Case for an implicit internal argument, to begin with (see 17).

Similarly, I would like to suggest the following derivation for *-ni yotte* passive (10):

- (19)a. \*zyuugyoo-in-zenin-ga Yamada-butyo -Ø  
 employee -all -Nom Yamada-manager-Ø  
 kaisya -tookyoku-ni taisite sutoraiki-o  
 company-authority -toward strike -Acc  
 ketugi-kekkoo -s-i-ta. =====>  
 decide-carry out - -Pst  
 ‘(Lit.) All employees *acted on and affected* Mr. Yamada by deciding and carrying out a strike toward the company.’
- b. Yamada-butyo<sub>i</sub>-ga zyuugyoo-in-zenin-ni yotte  $t_i$   
 ↑ \_\_\_\_\_  
 NP movement  
 kaisya-tookyoku-ni taisite sutoraiki-o ketugi-kekkoo-s-are-ta.

Under the implicit object analysis, (19a) is a possible initial structure in Japanese. In (19a), the agentive predicate *ketugi-kekkoo-sita* ‘decided and carried out’ selects the hidden internal argument *Yamada-butyo* ‘Yamada-manager.’ Thus, the literal translation of (19a) is ‘all employees *acted on and affected* Mr. Yamada by deciding and carrying out a strike toward the company.’ (19a) is ill-formed, because the implicit object cannot receive Case from the agentive verb *ketugi-kekkoo-sita*. The *-ni yotte* passive sentence, however, can be successfully generated from structure (19a) by means of NP movement. This is so, because as shown in (19b), the hidden internal argument *Yamada-butyo* receives Nominative Case in the subject position after intransitivization and undergoing NP movement.

The hidden object analysis above also accounts for

the contrast between (12a) and (12b) by supposing the following representations:

- (20)a. \*Sihonka -tati-ga nihon-Ø utokusii  
 capitalist-pl. -Nom Japan-Ø beautiful  
 sizen -o hakais-i-te i-ru  
 nature-Acc destroy -Pres  
 ‘(Lit.) Capitalists *acted on and affected* Japan by destroying its beautiful nature.’
- b. \*\*Aru gaikokuzin-ga nihon-Ø utokusii  
 a foreigner-Nom Japan-Ø beautiful  
 zyosei -to kekkon-s-i-ta.  
 woman-with marry -Pst  
 ‘(Lit.) A foreigner *acted on and affected* Japan by marrying a beautiful woman.’

The predicates in (12a-b), *hakais* ‘destroy’ and *kekkons* ‘marry,’ are both agentive predicates, and thus, both of them can select the hidden internal argument, *nihon* ‘Japan,’ as shown in (20a-b). Semantically, it is possible for capitalists to *act on and affect* Japan by destroying its beautiful nature, but it is not possible for a foreigner to *act on and affect* countries such as Japan in any obvious way, by marrying a beautiful woman. Hence, we can generate an acceptable *-ni yotte* passive from (20a) (see 12a; cf. 18 and 19b), while it is impossible for us to derive from (20b) a well-formed *-ni yotte* passive (see 12b).

The implicit object analysis suggested in this paper also provides a natural way to account for the ill-formedness of (15), repeated here as (21a). This is so, because the following derivation can never be available to (15/21a):

- (21)a. \*\*\*[ame-ga Yamada-Ø hut-ta] =====>  
 Rain-Nom Yamada-Ø fall-Pst  
 ‘(Lit.) Rain *acted on and affected* Yamada by falling.’
- b. \*\*\*Yamada<sub>i</sub>-ga ame-ni yotte  $t_i$  hur-are-ta.  
 ↑ \_\_\_\_\_  
 NP movement

(21a-b) are totally out, because only an agentive predicate may select an implicit *affectee* object. The Japanese predicate *hur* ‘fall’ is clearly a non-agentive verb. Hence, [<sub>v</sub> *hur*] cannot take the implicit *affectee* object, *Yamada* as in (20a-b). Consequently, (21a) is an ill-formed underlying representation, and (21b) is an unacceptable derived structure.

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper, I have examined the nature of *-ni yotte* passive in Japanese based on Kuroda (1979, 1985,

1992), Saito (1982), Kuno (1983, 1986), etc. After showing that neither Kuroda's NP movement analysis nor Kuno's bi-clausal analysis is free from a problem, I have suggested a tentative analysis where I have tried to develop further Kuroda's NP movement analysis. Namely, I have proposed that an agentive predicate in Japanese can license a hidden/implicit internal argument which the agent of the predicate *acts on and affects* by carrying out the action described by the verb phrase (cf. Alsina's 1992 analysis of causative constructions). In so doing, I have shown that the suggested hypothesis provides us with a way to account for all the data in this paper under Kuroda's NP movement analysis. As always, further research is necessary, for us to see if the proposal in this paper can reveal some other properties of the semantics of predicates.

#### References

- Alsina, A. (1992) 'On the Argument Structure of Causative,' *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 517-555.
- Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris.
- Harada, S.-I. (1973) 'Counter Equi NP Deletion,' *Annual Bulletin*, Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics, University of Tokyo, 8, 133-143.
- Kuno, S. (1983) *Shin-nihon Bunpo*, Taishukan.
- Kuno, S. (1986) 'Ukemi-bun no imi,' *Nihongogaku* 5(2), 70-87.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1965) *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language*, MIT dissertation, MIT. Reprinted, Garland Press, 1979.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1978) 'Case-Marking, Canonical Sentence Patterns and Counter Equi in Japanese,' in Hinds and Howard (1978), pp. 30-51. Reprinted in Kuroda (1992).
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1979) 'On Japanese Passives,' in Bedell, Kobayashi and Muraki (1979), pp. 305-347. Reprinted in Kuroda (1992).
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1983) 'What can Japanese Say about Government and Binding,' WCCFL 2, Stanford Linguistic Association, pp. 153-164. Reprinted in Kuroda (1992).
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1985) 'Ukemi ni tsuite no Kuno setsu o kaishaku suru,' *Nihongogaku* 4(10), 69-76.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1992) *Japanese Syntax and Semantics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ross, J. (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Saito, M. (1982) 'Case Marking in Japanese: A Preliminary Study,' ms., MIT.
- Shibatani, M. (1973) 'Semantics of Japanese Causativization,' *Foundations of Language* 9, 327-373.