

On Two Types of Japanese Passives¹

Yuji Tanaka

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to explore the difference between the two types of Japanese passives that have been referred to as "*ni* passives" and "*ni yotte* passives" in the literature. A *ni* passive is defined as the passive clause where the dative particle *-ni* is used to mark the "logical subject" of the verb, and a *ni yotte* passive is the passive clause where the complex particle *-ni yotte* is used instead.¹ An example of each type is given in (1).²

- (1) a. John-ga Bill-ni tasuke-rare-ta.
J.-Nom B.-Dat help-Pass-Past
b. John-ga Bill-ni yotte tasuke-rare-ta.
J.-Nom B.-BY help-Pass-Past
'John was helped by Bill.'

Both of these passives can be used to describe the same situation as the active sentence in (2).

- (2) Bill-ga John-o tasuke-ta.
B.-Nom J.-Acc help-Past
'Bill helped John.'

Thus, we will refer to active sentences such as this as the "active counterparts" or

* I am deeply indebted to Kazuki Kuwabara, Takuzo Sato, and Masanobu Ueda for their invaluable comments. My thanks also go to Koji Nabeya, Ken'ichiro Nogawa, and Takeshi Shimada, who read earlier drafts of this paper, and suggested stylistic improvements.

1 I will call the nominal constituent of a passive clause that could serve as subject in an active clause as the "logical subject of the verb" or simply "logical subject," following Chomsky (1965), for lack of a better term. For example, *Bill* is the logical subject of the verb *tasuke-* 'help' in both (1a) and (1b). I will also use the term "agent" or "agentive phrase" to refer to the same element. Strictly speaking, these terms are misleading because the logical subject does not necessarily bear the role of agent (cf. (3)).

2 The particle *-ni yotte* comprises the dative particle *-ni*, the verb *yor-*, and the suffix *-te*, and is used to indicate "means, cause, agent of passive sentence, or dependency on a situation" (Makino and Tsutsui 1995:292). See also section 7. This particle could be translated roughly as 'be due to' or 'be caused by', which is too long to employ as a gloss in the example. It will be given the label 'BY' throughout this paper. It should be noted that the label has no theoretical significance whatever.

"corresponding actives" of passive sentences.

The logical subject is not always marked by both *-ni* and *-ni yotte* in the passive. There are quite a few instances in which these two particles are in complementary distribution, that is, not in free variation. Although *minna* 'everyone' in (3b) and *gityoo* 'chairman' in (4b) could serve as subject in an active clause, as shown in (3a) and (4a), the former can only be marked with *-ni*, while the latter can only be marked with *-ni yotte*.

- (3) a. *Minna-ga Hanako-o kirat-ta.*
 everyone-Nom H.-Acc hate-Past
 'Everyone hated Hanako.'
- b. *Hanako-ga minna{-ni/*-ni yotte} kiraw-are-ta.*
 H.-Nom everyone{-Dat/*-BY} hate-Pass-Past
 'Hanako was hated by everyone.'
- (4) a. *Gityoo-ga kaikai-o sengensi-ta.*
 chairman-Nom opening-Acc declare-Past
 'The chairman declared the opening of the meeting.'
- b. *Kaikai-ga gityoo{* -ni/-ni yotte} sengens-are-ta.*
 opening-Nom chairman{* -Dat/-BY} declare-Pass-Past
 'The opening of the meeting was declared by the chairman.'

It may be presumed that the two particles are subjected to different conditions. In the following sections, I hope to make clear such conditions.

It has been argued that the *ni* passive is different from the *ni yotte* passive in that the NP in subject position is given a specific interpretation in the former, but not in the latter. Inoue (1976:84) states that "*ni* has the meaning of 'influence of the agent' on the passive subject. Its difference from *ni yotte* is: *ni* may be used only in cases where the passive subject and the agent are closely related to each other in this sense. If the passive subject is such that it does not feel such influence, or that it does not receive the direct effect of such influence, one cannot use *ni*. Therefore, if the passive subject is inanimate, *ni* is often excluded" (translated by Kuroda 1979:309–310). Based on Inoue's insightful observation, Kuroda (1979) argues (i) the *ni* and the *ni yotte* passive are distinguished in terms of their underlying syntactic structures, and (ii) that the structural distinction is motivated by the semantic notion called "affectivity."

These previous studies are motivated by the fact that the *ni yotte* passive is a recent innovation. As Kinsui (1991:11) points out, the *ni yotte* passive was invented on the model of the *ni* passive in the 19th century for the purpose of translating

passive sentences from Dutch into Japanese, and has ever since been developed independently (see also Kuroda 1979:337). Thus, it is not surprising that the *ni yotte* passive is more or less limited to the written language.

Kuroda's study has expanded and deepened our insight into the distinction between the two types of passives, but his argument is mostly based on subtle differences that are extremely hard to detect. Very often, speakers do not find the difference that he claims is lying between them. Unfortunately, recent studies on Japanese passives just grant credit to his analysis without any serious discussion (e.g. Hoshi 1991). I believe that Kuroda's theory still needs and deserves careful scrutiny.

The present paper can be divided into two parts. The first part (§§ 2–4) is devoted to critical examination of Kuroda's theory. First, his treatment of the *ni* and the *ni yotte* passive will be sketched out in section 2, and then examined from the semantic and syntactic points of view in sections 3 and 4. Some problems will be pointed out there. In the second part of this paper (§§ 5–7), I will develop my own analysis. In section 5, it will be demonstrated that what is crucially involved in the distribution of each type of passives is the distinction between the inclusion and the exclusion passive introduced by Washio (1993, 1995). In section 6, it will be argued that both types of passives are paired with different meanings. The meaning associated with the *ni yotte* passive will be motivated in section 7. Offered in section 8 is a concluding remark.

2 Kuroda on Nonuniform Treatment of *Ni* and *Ni Yotte* Passives

Kuroda (1979:308) argues that the *ni* and the *ni yotte* passive should be distinguished in terms of their syntactic configurations at the level of underlying structure: "a passive sentence with the agent phrase accompanied by the particle *ni yotte* is derived from the corresponding active sentence by an operation of preposing a noun phrase constituent, while a passive sentence whose underlying active subject surfaces with the particle *ni* (. . .) is derived from (. . .) a structure with an embedded sentence whose matrix subject is the affectee." Thus, (1a) and (1b) would be assigned different deep structures such as (5a) and (5b).³

- (5) a. [s John [s Bill John tasuke-] -rare-ta]
 b. [s Bill John tasuke-ta]

The *ni yotte* passive (1b) is derived from the deep structure (5b) by attaching the passive morpheme *-rare-* to the verb *tasuke-* 'help', replacing the subject *Bill* with

3 Case particles are assumed to be inserted after the NPs by transformations (cf. Kuroda 1965).

the object *John*, and combining the subject with *-ni yotte* to form an adjunct or oblique phrase.⁴ (5b) is realized as the active (2) unless passivization applies to it. What Kuroda (1979:336) is assuming in this analysis is that the *ni yotte* passive is "cognitively synonymous with the corresponding active form inasmuch as the English passive sentence may be considered cognitively synonymous with the corresponding active sentence." Clearly, he attempts to assimilate the Japanese *ni yotte* passive to the English *be* passive both syntactically and semantically. Accordingly, the transformational rule he lays down for the *ni yotte* passive is formulated in a parallel fashion to the rule of passivization widely adopted in English transformational grammar (cf. Chomsky 1965:103–106).

The *ni* passive (1a), on the other hand, has as its base structure (5a), which consists of the passive morpheme *-rare-* that functions as the main predicate and has the NP *John* and the tenseless clause *Bill John tasuke-* for its subject and complement.⁵ The subject of the *ni* passive is understood as the "affectee," that is, the person or thing that is in the "affective" relation to the event described by the complement clause. Thus, (1a) means that John was affected by being helped by Bill, not just John was helped by Bill, and is not "cognitively synonymous" with either (1b) or (2). "The *ni* passive form (. . .) carries a connotation of affectivity, which semantically distinguishes it from the *ni yotte* passive form" (Kuroda 1979:310). We will discuss the nature of the notion "affectivity" in the next section.

It should be noted here that both (1a) and (1b) are subsumed under the category of direct passives. A direct passive is defined as the passive construction whose sub-

4 Kuroda's approach to the *ni yotte* passive is similar to the nonuniform theory, that is, the idea of treating direct and indirect passives differently (cf. Kuno 1973, McCawley 1972). I will touch on the difference between the direct and the indirect passive shortly. Nonetheless, Kuroda's theory differs from the nonuniform theory in that it separates the *ni* and the *ni yotte* passive, not the direct and the indirect passive. In fact, Kuroda is an early proponent of uniform treatment of direct and indirect passives (see also Howard and Niyekawa-Howard 1976, Kuno 1983, Kuroda 1965, Makino 1972, among others). Thus, Kuroda (1979:308) says: "to the extent relevant to [the controversy between the uniform and the nonuniform theory fought over the *ni* passive], I am holding to uniform treatment of passives. What I am proposing is a nonuniform treatment of passives with *ni* and *ni yotte*."

5 It has been assumed in Japanese transformational grammar that this base structure is converted into the *ni* passive by raising the verb *tasuke-* from the complement to the matrix clause, attaching it to the matrix verb *-rare-*, and deleting the complement object *John* under identity with the matrix subject. For recent discussion of the syntax of Japanese passives, cf. Hoshi (1991), Kitagawa (1986), Miyagawa (1989), Washio (1990), among others.

ject corresponds to the logical object of the verb to which *-rare-* is attached. (Nevertheless, the *ni* passive and the *ni yotte* passive differ from each other with respect to the correspondence of the subject *John* with the object of the verb *tasuke-* 'help': The subject and object are related by the so-called equi-NP deletion in the former, and by NP movement in the latter.) The direct passive is in contrast with the indirect passive. An indirect passive is defined as the passive clause whose subject does not bear any grammatical or semantic relation to the verb.

Given that every *ni yotte* passive must be transformationally related to some active sentence, we could account for the fact that *-ni yotte*, as opposed to *-ni*, cannot be used to mark the logical subject in indirect passives:

- (6) a. John-ga Bill{-ni/*-ni yotte} atama-o but-are-ta.
 J.-Nom B.{-Dat/*-BY} head-Acc hit-Pass-Past
 'John was hit on the head by Bill.'
- b. John-ga Mary{-ni/*-ni yotte} nak-are-ta.
 J.-Nom M.{-Dat/-BY} cry-Pass-Past
 'John was cried on by Mary.'

In each of these examples, the version that has *-ni yotte* is unacceptable. The reason for their unacceptability would be that neither of the *ni yotte* passives has a well-formed active counterpart. Since passivization is assumed to apply to the direct or accusative object of a verb, the active sentences corresponding to (6a)–(6b) would be the ill-formed sequences **Bill-ga John-o atama-o but-ta* and **Mary-ga John-o nai-ta*. Note that intransitive verbs do not normally occur with an accusative object, and that Japanese does not permit double accusative objects in a simple clause. By contrast, the versions of (6a) and (6b) that have *-ni* are acceptable, because the subject of the *ni* passive is not necessarily identical with the object of the complement verb. The base structures of these indirect passives would be produced by replacing the complement clause *Bill John tasuke-* in (5b) with *Bill atama but-* and *Mary nak-*.

To summarize, on Kuroda's view, *ni yotte* passives must have the form of the direct passive, while *ni* passives may have the form of both the direct and the indirect passive. This discrepancy between the two types of passives comes down to difference between two homonymous *-rare-*'s. The *-rare-* of the *ni yotte* passive is a "meaningless" suffix attached to a transitive verb in the course of derivation; it just functions as an overt indication of the passive voice. The *-rare-* of the *ni* passive, on the other hand, functions as a predicate that selects an NP and a tenseless clause as the subject and complement; it designates the "affective" relationship between the two arguments.

3 On the Notion of "Affectivity"

The difference between the *ni* passive and the *ni yotte* passive is, according to Kuroda (1979), that the subject is construed as affectee in the former, but not in the latter.⁶ In short, the *ni* passive carries a connotation of affectivity, which semantically distinguishes it from the *ni yotte* passive. In what follows, we will discuss rather briefly the nature of the notion "affectivity" that Kuroda has in mind (§ 3.1), and go into problems with it (§§ 3.2–3.3).

3.1 The Manifestations of Affectivity

According to Kuroda (1979:310–311), affectivity is the semantic concept that 'might (. . .) be understood only as a conceptual "development" that manifests itself in various forms of semantic effects, depending on other factors such as the lexical meaning of other elements in the sentence' and should be distinguished from adversity. *Ni* passives are invariably characterized by the notion of affectivity, but they do not always have the meaning "the passive subject is adversely affected." For discussion on adversity, cf. Kuno (1983), Oehrle and Nishio (1981), Washio (1993, 1995), and Wierzbicka (1988, chap. 4).

In some cases, the notion of affectivity is identified with what Kuroda terms as an "epistemologico-existential feature," which was discovered by the philosophical study in the structure of consciousness (i.e. Jean-Paul Sartre's *L'Être et le Néant*, cited by (Kuroda 1979, § 7)). He argues that the subject of the *ni* passive (1a), *John-ga Bill-ni tasuke-rare-ta*, is understood as the person whose consciousness was affected by being helped by Bill, but the subject of the *ni yotte* passive (1b), which is different from (1a) in that it has *-ni yotte* instead of *-ni*, does not receive such an interpretation. Kuroda (ibid., 319) maintains that this is borne out by the fact that an adverbial like *moo sukosi-de ki-o usina-u tokoro-o* 'when he was about to lose consciousness' can be inserted after the passive subject in (1a), but not in (1b), since John may not have been affected psychologically if he had lost his consciousness.⁷

There are some *ni* passives that cannot hint at a sort of awareness on the part of the subject's referent. The *ni* passive in (7) is a case in point.

6 Kuroda is using the term "affectee" in a different sense from the usual sense of the term, as we will see below. This term is normally used to refer to the entity that undergoes a change of location or state. Obviously, Kuroda's sense of the term is far more general than the usual one.

7 It seems to me that the adverbial in question can also be inserted after the subject of the *ni yotte* passive. That is to say, the sentence *John-ga moo sukosi-de ki-o usina-u tokoro-o Bill-ni yotte tasuke-rare-ta* is, in my judgment, no less acceptable than *John-ga moo sukosi-de ki-o usina-u tokoro-o Bill-ni tasuke-rare-ta*.

- (7) *Daitooryoo-ga CIA-ni koros-are-ta.*
 president-Nom CIA-Dat kill-Pass-Past
 'The president was killed by the CIA.'

It is impossible to interpret *daitooryoo* 'president' as the person whose consciousness was affected, because the president was killed, which means the very end of his life and thus consciousness. It is assumed in Kuroda (1979, §§ 12–16) that in this case, the affective connotation manifests itself in a different form: The subject's referent is held responsible for letting the murder happen. According to Kuroda, (7) would be felicitous if the speaker "had suspected that the CIA might assassinate the president and also believed that the president should have had the same suspicion" (*ibid.*, 326).

Kuroda argues that this analysis is borne out by the following pair of examples:

- (8) a. *Daitooryoo-ga orokanimo CIA-ni koros-are-te simat-ta.*
 b. *Daitooryoo-ga orokanimo CIA-ni yotte koros-are-te simat-ta.*

The *ni* passive (8a) is acceptable, as opposed to the *ni yotte* passive (8b), which is "unacceptable as a surface form, without a permissible reading" (*ibid.*, 326). The reason for this contrast is, according to Kuroda, that the adverb *orokanimo* 'stupidly' is compatible with the *ni* passive, but not with the *ni yotte* passive, in the context followed by the auxiliary-verb construction *-te simaw-*. As Kuroda points out, *-te simaw-* is ambiguous between the "subject-responsibility" and "outer-responsibility" readings: It "expresses the idea that someone did something which he shouldn't have done or something happened which shouldn't have happened" (Makino and Tsutsui 1986:404).⁸ A *-te simaw-* sentence is disambiguated when it contains *orokanimo* 'stupidly'. This is because this adverb attributes the notion of responsibility to the grammatical subject of the sentence where it occurs. Thus, the affectee subject of (7) is allowed to occur with *orokanimo* and *-te simaw-* simultaneously, as in (8a). By contrast, the *ni yotte* passive *Daitooryoo-ga CIA-ni yotte koros-are-ta* could not be licensed in the same environment, since its subject does not bear the affectee role. Hence the unacceptability of (8b).⁹

3.2 The Cancellability of Affectee

The subject of the *ni* passive should be understood as affectee, if Kuroda were

8 Note that that *something* is described by the clause preceding this auxiliary-verb construction.

9 Again, my judgment departs from Kuroda's. (8b) may sound slightly unnatural, in contrast with (8a), but it is not so bad as Kuroda claims.

on the right track. To take an example discussed in his paper (1979:314–319), the subject of the *ni* passive with a verb of perception such as *mi-* 'to see' is understood as the person who is affected by recognizing that he has been seen by someone else:

- (9) Bill-ga nozokimisi-te i-ru tokoro-o John-ni mi-rare-ta.
 B.-Nom peep-Ger be-Pres place-Acc J.-Dat see-Pass-Past
 'Bill was seen by John, as he was peeping.'

The sentence suggests the shame that Bill felt, or should felt, at having done the peeping, of course, when he noticed that he was seen by John. Kuroda argues that this semantic effect should reflect the affectivity of the *ni* passive in question.¹⁰ Suppose, however, that John was not aware of Bill's eyes upon him, absorbed in peeping, but the speaker observed everything. In this context, (9) also makes sense. Thus the following example is appropriate:

- (10) Bill-wa nozokimisi-te i-ru tokoro-o John-ni mi-rare-ta koto-ni
 B.-Top peep-Ger be-Pres place-Acc J.-Dat see-Pass-Past thing-Dat
 kizuk-anakat-ta.
 notice-Neg-Past
 'Bill didn't notice that he was seen by John, as he was peeping.'

Note that it is the speaker who was affected here, because his/her consciousness reacted to the event of Bill's being seen by John. The acceptability of this sentence suggests that the subject of the *ni* passive is not always construed as affectee.

A problem arises if affectee is assumed to be a semantic or thematic role such as theme, goal, or instrument. Thematic roles in general cannot be overridden by contextual factors. For instance, an NP which bears the role of instrument, that is, has the positive value of the feature "instrumenthood," designates a tool or device that someone uses in order to do a particular task or achieve a particular aim, and this value cannot be negated, as shown below:

10 The passive of sensory verb complement sentences in English poses a problem for Kuroda's analysis. As Kirsner (1977:174) points out, passive sentences such as *John was seen (by Sam) to cross the street* have a connotation of "inadvertence." Based on Kirsner's observation, Kuno (1983, chap. 12) argues that English passives of perception verbs have parallels with Japanese passives like (9). To deal with the parallels within his own framework, Kuroda would have to posit an extra *be* passive, which is similar in structure, meaning, and function to the Japanese *ni* passive.

- (11) *Taroo-wa hasi-de gohan-o tabe-ta kedo, hasi-wa
 T.-Top chopsticks-with rice-Acc eat-Past but chopsticks-Top
 tukaw-anakat-ta.
 use-Neg-Past
 '*Taro ate rice with chopsticks, but he didn't use chopsticks.'

The NP *hasi*, marked with instrumental *-de*, is assigned the instrument role in the first conjunct, which thus suggests that Taro used chopsticks. But this implication is explicitly negated by the second conjunct. Therefore the sentence as a whole is contradictory in that it does not describe any possible situation. Note that (10) does not incur such a contradiction. The claim that the subject of the *ni* passive is construed as affectee is therefore called into question.

One might suggest that the affectee role is allowed to "shift" from subject to some other element. In fact, the speaker, instead of the subject, of (10) is understood as the affectee. It should be noted, however, that the *ni yotte* passive may also be subject to this interpretation, as shown in (12).

- (12) A! Anna tokoro-ni atarasii ie-ga tate-rare-te i-ru.
 Oh such place-Dat new house-Nom build-Pass-Ger be-Pres
 'My God! A new house is being built in such a place.'

In this sentence, as well as in (10), the speaker is surprised at and thus affected by the unexpected emergence of a new house into his/her consciousness. Since the passive verb *tate-rare-* normally occurs with *-ni yotte* (cf. *Atarasii ie-ga murabitotati-ni yotte tate-rare-te i-ru* vs. **Atarasii ie-ga murabitotati-ni tate-rare-te i-ru*), (12) should not have the affectee role to pass on to the speaker. This observation leads us to the conclusion that whether or not the speaker may bear this role should be dissociated from the distinction between the *ni* and the *ni yotte* passive.

3.3 Inanimate Passive Subjects

Insentient beings do not have consciousness, unlike John in (1a), nor do they take the responsibility for an incident, as the president does in (7). Thus, as Inoue (1976:84) points out, inanimate NPs tend to be excluded from the subject position of the *ni* passive. Yet, there are quite a few *ni* passives which permit the inanimate subject, as shown in (13a).

- (13) a. Ano mati-wa Nihongun-ni hakais-are-ta.
 that city-Top Japanese Army-Dat destroy-Pass-Past

- b. *Ano mati-wa Nihongun-ni yotte hakais-are-ta.*

Japanese Army-BY

'The city was destroyed by the Japanese Army.'

The particle *-ni* here can be replaced with *-ni yotte*, as in (13b). On Kuroda's analysis, the subject *ano mati* 'the city' would be construed as affectee in (13a), but not in (13b), although the difference in meaning between these two examples is very subtle. The question to be considered here is in what sense the city is taken to be affected in the one, but not in the other.

Kuroda (1979:330) argues that "the *ni* passive form with an inanimate noun phrase as the passive subject is in the perfect aspect." In short, the perfect aspect is a manifestation of the affectivity of *ni* passives such as (13a). Thus, this *ni* passive is, in his intuition, used to describe the ruin, which is the result of the Japanese Army's attack on a city, whereas the *ni yotte* passive in (13b) is an objective statement about the fact that the Japanese Army destroyed the city. According to Kuroda, the perfect aspect of (13a) would become clear in the context followed by the auxiliary-verb construction *-te i-*, as in (14).

- (14) *Ano mati-wa Nihongun-ni hakais-are-te i-ru.*
 that city-Top Japanese Army-Dat destroy-Pass-Ger be-Pres

The *-te i-* construction, as is well known, is ambiguous between the "progressive" reading and the "perfect" reading. Whether a given *-te i-* sentence receives the progressive or perfect reading is largely determined by the meaning of the verb to which *-te i-* is attached and other elements in the sentence. Thus, the intransitive sentence in (15a) is in the perfect aspect; the transitive sentence in (15b) is in the progressive aspect; and the passive counterpart of this transitive sentence in (15c) is ambiguous between the progressive and perfect readings.

- (15) a. *Akikan-ga tubure-te i-ru.*
 empty can-Nom collapse-Ger be-Pres
 'An empty can is squashed.'
- b. *Kodomotati-ga akikan-o tubusi-te i-ru.*
 children-Nom empty can-Acc squash-Ger be-Pres
 'The children are squashing empty cans.'
- c. *Akikan-ga tubus-are-te i-ru.*
 empty can-Nom squash-Pass-Ger be-Pres
 'An empty can is (being) squashed.'

The ambiguity of the passive (15c) calls into question the validity of Kuroda's

ing in a *-te i-* sentence.

What has been demonstrated in the above discussion is that the role of affectee is determined by contextual factors, and thus sometimes overridden. This leads to the conclusion that affectivity is not a semantic element associated with the *ni* passive. It seems to me that Kuroda is mistaken in assuming that passives divide into two groups, depending on whether or not the subject is construed as affectee. It is true that the *ni* passive and the *ni yotte* passive are different semantically, not to mention syntactically, but in my opinion, affectivity or the affective connotation does not provide the conceptual base for the dichotomy between these two types of passives, let alone lends support to the syntactic differentiation between them. In the next section, we will discuss some syntactic problems with Kuroda's analysis.

4 Syntactic Problems with Kuroda's Analysis

Kuroda (1979) proposes that *ni yotte* passives are transformationally related to the active counterparts. However, his proposal is empirically inadequate. For one thing, some verbs or classes of verbs are not allowed to occur in the *ni yotte* passive even though they make up a well-formed transitive clause, which is seen as the input for the transformation (§ 4.1). Moreover, *-ni yotte* is not limited to the direct passive; it may also occur in the indirect passive, which does not have the active counterpart from which it is derived (§ 4.2).

4.1 Lexical Blocking

Verbs of perception such as *mi-* 'to see' are allowed in the *ni* passive, but not in the *ni yotte* passive:

- (18) John-ga Bill{-ni/*-ni yotte} mi-rare-ta.
 J.-Nom B.{-Dat/*-BY} see-Pass-Past
 'John was seen by Bill.'

This fact poses a problem for Kuroda's idea of relating *ni yotte* passives to their active counterparts via passivization, since the verb *mi-* may serve as the head of a transitive clause such as *Bill-ga John-o mi-ta* 'Bill saw John'. An active sentence like this is formally indistinguishable from *Bill-ga John-o tasuke-ta* 'Bill helped John', which can be converted into a *ni yotte* passive (e.g. *John-ga Bill-ni tasuke-rare-ta*). The version of (18) that has *-ni yotte* instead of *-ni* should be grammatical, given the transformational rule posited by Kuroda.

Kuroda (1979:316) tries to circumvent this problem by saying that the *ni yotte* passive in question is "simply ungrammatical"; it is blocked because the "lexically passive" or "ergative" sentence in (19) carries out the function that the *ni yotte* pas-

sive in (18) is supposed to carry out.

- (19) Bill-ni John-ga mie-ta.
 B.-Dat J.-Nom be visible to-Past
 'John is visible to Bill' or 'John is in Bill's sight'

However, a problem arises if we adopt such pre-emption. Many transitive verbs are excluded from the *ni yotte* passive even if they do not have lexically passive or ergative counterparts:

- (20) a. Taroo-ga sensei{-ni/*-ni yotte} home-rare-ta.
 T.-Nom teacher{-Dat/*-BY} praise-Pass-Past
 'Taro was praised yesterday.'
 b. Ziroo-ga oniisan{-ni/*-ni yotte} but-are-ta.
 Z.-Nom elder brother{-Dat/*-BY} hit-Pass-Past
 'Jiro was hit by his brother.'
 c. Hanako-ga misiranu otoko{-ni/*ni yotte} ker-rare-ta.
 H.-Nom unknown man{-Dat/*-BY} kick-Pass-Past
 'Hanako was kicked by a stranger.'

Therefore, the account Kuroda gives of the unacceptability of the *ni yotte* passive in (18) must be called into question.

One might suggest that the object of the verbs in (20) bears the role of affectee from the beginning. However, as we have discussed in the previous section, whether affectee is assigned to one nominal or another is mainly determined by contextual factors; it is not a kind of semantic or thematic role that a predicate assigns to an argument it takes. One might also claim that the meaning of the verbs in question is not suitable to the "objective" nature of the *ni yotte* passive. But this claim seems dubious, because there certainly arises an occasion where it is necessary to express objectively the propositions that Taro was praised by the teacher, Jiro was hit by his brother, and Hanako was kicked by a stranger. Anyway, the reason for the unacceptability of the *ni yotte* passives in (18) and (20) cannot be explicated in purely syntactic terms.

4.2 Indirect Passives vs. Ni Yotte Passives

The merit of Kuroda's analysis lies in the fact that there are no such indirect passives as those adduced in (21).

- (21) a. *Suzuki-ga okusan-ni yotte nige-rare-ta.
 S.-Nom wife-BY run away-Pass-Past
 'Mr. Suzuki was deserted by his wife.'

- b. *Taroo-ga kodomo-ni yotte nak-are-ta.
 T.-Nom child-BY cry-Pass-Past
 'Taro was cried on by his child.'
- c. *Hanako-ga gosyuzin-ni yotte sin-are-ta.
 H.-Nom husband-BY die-Pass-Past
 'Hanako was died on by her husband.'

Kuroda's interpretation is that these *ni yotte* passives are ungrammatical because they do not have any well-formed active counterparts. Intransitive verbs do not normally occur with an accusative object. Note in passing that (21a)–(21c) would be acceptable if they contain *-ni* instead of *-ni yotte*.

However, as Kuroda (1979, § 26) himself concedes, *ni yotte* passives such as (22) are acceptable, if not perfect.

- (22) Nihon-wa sihonkatati-ni yotte utokusii sizen-o hakais-are-te i-ru.
 Japan-Top capitalists-BY beautiful nature-Acc destroy-Pass-Past be-Pres
 'Beautiful nature in Japan is being destroyed by capitalists.'

The subject *Nihon* does not correspond to the object of the verb *hakais-*, because it refers to the place where the destruction is being carried out, rather than the thing that is destroyed. The verb's object is realized by *utokusii sizen*. Thus, (22) is, without doubt, classified as an indirect passive, and the existence of such indirect passives is difficult to account for within the framework assumed by Kuroda.

The solution that Kuroda offers as a way out of this problem is to expand the domain of application of passivization. He states that "the direct object is not the only term that may be *ni yotte*-passivized" (1979:338). There is no theoretically compelling reason to identify the subject of a *ni yotte* passive with the logical object of its verb that could be embodied as a direct or accusative object in an active clause. Thus he proposes that the passive subject of (22), *Nihon* 'Japan', corresponds either to the locative expression marked with *-de* in the active sentence *Sihonkatati-ga Nihon-de utokusii sizen-o hakaisi-te i-ru*, or to the genitive modifier preceding the accusative object in *Sihonkatati-ga Nihon-no utokusii sizen-o hakaisi-te i-ru*.¹³

If a locative *de* phrase should be able to become the passive subject, the grammatical system would be extremely powerful in that it allows the derivation of an ungrammatical *ni yotte* passive like (23) from the grammatical active *Hanako-ga*

13 This analysis is reminiscent of the so-called possessor ascension, a grammatical process much discussed within the framework of Relational Grammar (cf. Perlmutter 1983).

Taroo-no heya-de nai-ta 'Hanako cried in Taro's room'.

- (23) **Taroo-no heya-ga Hanako-ni yotte nak-are-ta.*
 T.-Gen room-Nom H.-BY cry-Pass-Past
 '*Taro's room was cried in by Hanako'

It is not at all clear how Kuroda can deal with such a problematic case, without ruling out well-formed examples such as (22). On the other hand, given that the passive subject in (22) is underlyingly a genitive modifier of the accusative object, we could account for the fact that (22) and (24) are truth-conditionally equivalent.

- (24) *Nihon-no utukusii sizen-wa sihonkatati-ni yotte hakais-are-te*
 Japan-Gen beautiful nature-Top capitalists-BY destroy-Pass-Ger
i-ru.
 be-Pres
 'The beautiful nature in Japan is being destroyed by capitalists.'

This sentence would be produced by preposing not only the genitive NP but also the accusative NP it modifies, and shares the base with (22). However, a question arises as to how Kuroda accounts for the following contrast.

- (25) a. *Ryoosyu-no yasiki-ga murabitotati-ni yotte tate-rare-te i-ru.*
 lord-Gen house-Nom villagers-BY build-Pass-Ger be-Pres
 'A house is being built for the lord by the villagers.'
 b. **Ryoosyu-ga murabitotati-ni yotte yasiki-o tate-rare-te i-ru.*
 lord-Nom villagers-BY house-Acc build-Pass-Ger be-Pres
 'The lord is being built a house by the villagers.'

Not only (25a), but also (25b) should be acceptable if passivization were allowed to apply to the modifier of the object of the verb, *ryoosyu*, as well as to the whole object *ryoosyu-no yasiki*, in the active sentence *Mura-no hitotati-ga ryoosyu-no yasiki-o tate-te i-ru*.

What has been shown in the above discussion is that it is extremely difficult to deal with the indirect passives with a *ni yotte* phrase in terms of their underlying syntactic configurations, in particular, to account for the ungrammaticality of (25b) without excluding (22) by means of the transformational rule posited by Kuroda. The syntactic mechanism that he provides for the generation of *ni yotte* passives is too strong to rule out nonexistent forms and too weak to produce actual forms.

5 The Distinction between Inclusion Passives and Exclusion Passives

Why is *-ni yotte* permitted in some indirect passives but not in others? The answer, I believe, lies in the distinction between *inclusion passives* and *exclusion passives*, yet another dichotomy of passive clauses developed by Washio (1993, 1995). The particle *-ni yotte* is somehow limited to the inclusion passive. Our objective in this section is to introduce the distinction between inclusion and exclusion passives (§ 5.1), to show its relevance to the difference between the *ni* and the *ni yotte* passive (§ 5.2), and to explore the semantic or conceptual motivation for the inclusion/exclusion distinction (§ 5.3).

5.1 Inclusion Passives versus Exclusion Passives

Washio (1993, 1995) argues that Japanese passives are divided into two groups, depending on whether the subject is semantically included in, or excluded from, what is analyzed as the complement of *-rare-* in generative grammar. The term "inclusion passive" is used to refer to the passive construction whose subject is related to, though not necessarily identical with, the object of the "complement" verb. Thus direct passives (e.g. *Taroo-ga sensei-ni tatak-are-ta* 'Taro was hit by the teacher') are prototypical instances of the inclusion passive. The term "exclusion passive," on the other hand, is used to refer to the passive construction whose subject bears no semantic relation whatever to the complement clause. Thus indirect passives with an intransitive verb (e.g. *Taroo-ga tuma-ni nige-rare-ta* 'Taro was deserted by his wife') are prototypical instances of the exclusion passive.

The distinction between inclusion and exclusion passives is more general than the distinction between direct and indirect passives. The direct/indirect distinction is based on the syntax of passive clauses. By contrast, the inclusion/exclusion distinction is semantic: Inclusion and exclusion passives are not necessarily different at the syntactic level. Sentences of the form *X-ga Y-ni Z-o V-rare-Tns* are unmistakably classified as indirect passives, but may be categorized into the inclusion or the exclusion passive, depending on their semantic structures. For example, the indirect passive in (26), as Washio demonstrates, is an inclusion passive if the accusative object *kodomo* 'child' is understood as Taro's, but an exclusion passive otherwise.

(26) *Taroo-ga sensei-ni kodomo-o home-rare-ta.*

T.-Nom teacher-Dat child-Acc praise-Pass-Past

'Taro had his child praised by the teacher' or 'Taro is such that the teacher praised someone else's child.'

The inclusion passive, as mentioned above, is neutral on the issue of whether the

subject corresponds to the object of the verb or has it in part semantically. Thus both of the following sentences are inclusion passive, although they are differentiated syntactically:

- (27) a. Taroo-ga sensei-ni tatak-are-ta.
 T.-Nom teacher-BY hit-Pass-Past
 'Taro was hit by the teacher.'
- b. Taroo-ga sensei-ni atama-o tatak-are-ta.
 T.-Nom teacher-BY head-Acc hit-Pass-Past
 'Taro was hit on the head by the teacher.'

Semantically, the difference between (27a) and (27b) is just that the former leaves it implicit which part of Taro's body was hit by the teacher but the latter makes it explicit. In other words, (27b) is more specific about the incident than (27a). Put conversely, (27a) is schematic for (27b). In fact, the former may also be used to describe the situations that the examples in (28) do, while the latter cannot.

- (28) Taroo-ga sensei-ni {kao/hoo/kata/osiri/senaka}-o tatak-are-ta.
 T.-Nom teacher-Dat {face/cheek/shoulder/bottom/back}-Acc hit-Pass-Past
 'Taro was hit on the face/cheek/shoulder/bottom/back by the teacher.'

Like *tatak-*, the verbs *ke-* 'kick', *sas-* 'stab', etc. permit the omission of the object (cf. (*atama-o*) *ke-rare-* 'be kicked on the head', (*mune-o*) *sas-are-* 'be stabbed in the heart').¹⁴

The indirect passive with a transitive verb is basically ambiguous between the inclusion and exclusion readings. Although the following sentence is similar in form to the inclusion passives (27b) and (28), it is preferably judged as an exclusion passive. This is so because the noun *kubi* 'neck' in construction with the verb *tur-* 'hang' is normally understood as belonging to the person referred to by the subject of the verb (i.e. Hanako here), as in the English *crane one's neck* (e.g. *He craned his neck* vs. **He craned her neck*).

- (29) Taroo-ga Hanako-ni kubi-o tur-are-ta.
 T.-Nom H.-Dat neck-Acc hang-Pass-Past
 'Taro is such that Hanako hung herself.'

14 The accusative objects in the verb phrases *asi-o hum-* 'tread on someone's foot', *te-o tukam-* 'grasp someone's hand' cannot be omitted in the passive. The omissibility of the accusative objects seems to be determined by whether or not the subject (i.e. *Taroo* in the above examples) can stand in the metonymic relation to the objects. In (27a), the subject does not refer to Taro, rather it designates his body part that is acted on by the teacher.

In the exclusion reading, Taro is not a participant of Hanako's hanging herself (he was probably not at the scene when she committed suicide). The act of hanging oneself is a self-contained event, so that there is no room for some other person(s) to play a role in. If (29) is embedded into some other context that forces us to take the object *kubi* as Taro's neck, however, it would turn to an inclusion passive and convey a completely different meaning, that is, 'Taro was hung by Hanako'.

Passive sentences of the form *X-ga Y-ni Z-o V-rare-Tns* change their meaning, depending on whether they are inclusion or exclusion passives. The ambiguity of such passives cannot be captured in terms of the syntactic dichotomy between direct and indirect passives, since they are formally the same. The distinction of the inclusion passive vs. the exclusion passive is called for in the treatment of those ambiguous passives. As we shall discuss shortly, the inclusion/exclusion distinction is also involved in the distribution of the *ni* and the *ni yotte* passive.

What is demonstrated in Washio (1993, 1995) is that the distinction between the inclusion and the exclusion passive is a critical factor in the description of linguistic phenomena in relation to the grammatical voice. He argues cogently from the cross-linguistic perspective that the inclusion passive, but not the exclusion passive, is permitted in languages like English, French, Korean, Mongolian, etc. Thus, most, if not all, direct passives may be rendered into these languages with the "ordinary" passive construction (e.g. the English *be* passive). However, inclusion passives with a transitive verb cannot be translated in the same way, as is clear from the contrast between the Japanese *Boku-wa hon-o nusum-are-ta* and the English **I was stolen a book*. Generally, languages like English do not tolerate the retained object (aside from dative passives such as *John was given a book*). Note that inclusion passives with a transitive verb may be translated with the causative construction instead.

In the languages examined by Washio, the causative construction is allowed to have the passive sense when the subject is semantically/pragmatically related to the object. To take an example discussed in Chomsky (1965:21–22), the English *have* construction *I had a book stolen* is ambiguous between the passive and causative readings, which are made clear when this sentence is followed by ". . . from my car when I stupidly left the window open" and ". . . from his library by a professional thief who I hired to do the job." Put more precisely, the sentence in question may receive the passive reading only if the subject *I* is understood as the owner of the

book referred to by the object *a book*.¹⁵ This suggests that the inclusion/exclusion distinction plays a crucial role in the disambiguation of *have* constructions. For related phenomena in the other languages, see Washio (1993; 1995, chaps. 3–4).

5.2 Grammatical Manifestations of the Inclusion/Exclusion Distinction

The inclusion/exclusion distinction is not only involved in the interpretation of passives, but reflected in their grammatical form. As we shall see in some detail below, it is only the inclusion passive that permits the agentive *ni yotte* phrase, and it is also the inclusion passive that may have the form of the reduced passive, that is, the passive that has no agentive phrase (i.e. an NP marked with *-ni* or *-ni yotte*).

5.2.1 The *ni yotte* passive

As we have observed in the previous section, agentive *-ni yotte* primarily occur in direct passives, but is excluded from indirect passives with an intransitive verb. Hence the following contrast:

- (30) a. Taroo-ga Hanako-ni yotte tasuke-rare-ta. 'Taro was rescued by Hanako.'
 b. *Taroo-ga Hanako-ni yotte nige-rare-ta. 'Taro was deserted by Hanako.'

We have also observed that *-ni yotte* is allowed to occur in indirect passives with a transitive verb, as shown in (31a).

- (31) a. Taroo-ga Hanako-ni yotte kubi-o sime-rare-ta.
 T.-Nom H.-BY neck-Acc close-Pass-Past
 'Taro was strangled by Hanako.'
 b. *Taroo-ga Hanako-ni yotte kubi-o tur-are-ta.
 T.-Nom H.-BY neck-Acc hang-Pass-Past
 'Taro is such that Hanako hung herself.'

But, as is clear from the unacceptability of (31b), every indirect passive with a transitive verb does not permit the *ni yotte* phrase.

Sentences (31a) and (31b) are minimally different in that the former contains the verb *sime-* and the latter the verb *tur-*. *Sime-* is normally used to describe the action of closing, tying, or fastening (e.g. *mado-o sime-* 'close the window', *zyaguti-o sime-* 'turn off the faucet', *nekutai-o sime-* 'wear a tie', etc.). It also means 'strangle' or 'kill someone by squeezing his/her throat' when it collocates with the accusative object

15 Otherwise, the passive reading of *I had a book stolen* is impossible. This *have* construction receives the causative reading unless the subject is understood as the owner of the book that was stolen by someone. The causative reading, however, is not restricted to the exclusion case and thus available even if the subject refers to the owner of the book.

kubi-o. In an active clause, the victim of strangulation may be expressed by an genitive NP modifying the nominal *kubi* (cf. *Hanako-ga Taro-no kubi-o sime-ta* 'Hanako strangled Taro') or left implicit in case it is easy to identify the victim by means of contextual factors (cf. *Hanako-ga kubi-o sime-ta* 'Hanako strangled (the person that I mentioned)'). In the passive (31a), then, the victim is associated with the subject (i.e. *Taroo*), and the object *kubi* is necessarily understood as Taro's neck. The sentence is, therefore, an instance of the inclusion passive, since the subject and object are semantically related.

The collocation of the verb *tur-* with the accusative object *kubi-o*, on the other hand, describes the act of (committing suicide by) hanging oneself, as we have discuss in (29). That is, the object *kubi* is semantically related to the agent of the action described by *tur-* (e.g. the *Hanako* of *Hanako-ni yotte* in (31b)). Therefore, (31b) is an instance of the exclusion interpretation, as opposed to the inclusion passive, since Taro is not a participant of the event of Hanako's hanging herself.

The contrast between (31a) and (31b) suggests that the agentive *ni yotte* phrase is somehow limited to the inclusion passive. This is borne out by the fact that (31b) is acceptable as an inclusion passive. Recall that (29), the passive that differs from (31b) only in that it has *-ni* instead of *-ni yotte*, is ambiguous between the inclusion and exclusion readings. (31b), as an inclusion passive, may sound like a slight exaggeration, but there seems to be no plausible reason to rule it out. Now a question arises about the reason for the limited distribution of the *ni yotte* phrase. The answer to this question will emerge from the observation of another grammatical phenomenon, that is, the missing indefinite agentive phrase.

5.2.2 *Reduced Passives*

The evidence for the difference in argumenthood between the agentive phrases of the inclusion and the exclusion passive can be seen in the fact that the indefinite agent may be missing from inclusion passives, but not from exclusion passives. Following McCawley (1988:81–83), I will call passive clauses that have no agentive phrase "reduced passives." An example of the reduced passive is given in (32a), where the missing agent is indefinite, rather than definite. That is, the missing agent in the reduced passive is a case of indefinite null instantiation, in the sense of Fillmore and Kay (1993).

- (32) a. *Taroo-ga tatak-are-ta*. 'Taro was hit (by someone).'
 b. **Taroo-ga nige-rare-ta*. 'Taro was deserted (by someone).'

By contrast, (32b) is unacceptable without the agentive phrase.¹⁶ This discrepancy suggests that the reduced form is only allowed with inclusion passives. Recall that direct passives such as (32a) are a prototype of the inclusion passive, while indirect passives with an intransitive verb such as (32b) are a prototype of the exclusion passive.

Further evidence is derived from the contrast between the following reduced passives.

- (33) a. Taroo-ga kubi-o sime-rare-ta. 'Taro was strangled (by someone).'
 b. *Taroo-ga kubi-o tur-are-ta. 'Taro is such that someone hung himself.'

The reduced passives (33a) and (33b) are comparable to the inclusion passive (31a) and the exclusion passive (31b), respectively. Moreover, (33b) will become acceptable if the object *kubi* is taken as Taro's neck, rather than someone else's, just like (31b).

It is worth noting the reduced passive *Nomo-wa saikin hasir-are-te bakari i-ru* 'Nomo-Top recently run-Pass-Ger always be-Pres'. This sentence describes how easy it is to steal a base from Nomo recently. Since the missing agent does not refer to any specific player(s), one might say that the acceptability of the reduced passive in question runs counter to our claim: The missing agent can be indefinite only in inclusion passives. Notice, however, that the intransitive verb *hasir-* here means 'steal a base', rather than 'run'. In a baseball game, the players in the field, in particular, in the infield, have the bases in their dominion, so that the pitcher is necessarily related to them. Thus, the sentence in question is semantically an inclusion passive, although it is formally an indirect passive.

In the light of the distribution of the missing agent, the agentive phrase must be optional in the inclusion passive, but obligatory in the exclusion passive. As observed in section 5.2.1, the *ni yotte* phrase is also limited to the inclusion passive. A question arises as to how these two phenomena are related to each other. I would suggest that the *ni yotte* phrase, designed to serve as an adjunct, that is, an optional element of sentence, is only allowed to designate the agent of the inclusion passive. We will see in section 7 that this assumption is not unreasonable. In the remainder of this section, we will discuss the relationship between the inclusion and the exclusion passive.

¹⁶ Exclusion passives, as well as inclusion passives, permit the definite null instantiation of the agentive phrase, which refers back to something given in the context. The definite interpretation of the missing agent is irrelevant to our discussion.

5.3 The Schematic Network of Passives

The exclusion passive designates a relationship between two entities: one is an action or event and the other is a person or thing. This person/thing corresponds to an NP in subject position, and the action/event corresponds to the verb that *-rare-* is attached to. The correspondences between the form and meaning of the exclusion passive is represented as in (34). The syntactic configuration (34a) corresponds to the semantic structure (34b) in the way indicated by the subscripts.¹⁷

- (34) a. [[NP-ga]_i . . . [V]₂-rare-Tns]_j
 b. [[Event]₂-[Thing]₁]_j

The Event constituent in (34b) is highly schematic as it stands, and must be instantiated by a specific event. Suppose that the double arrow stands for an action. Then an intransitive event can be represented as [Y⇒] and a transitive event can be represented as [Y⇒Z], where *Y* stands for the agent and *Z* for the patient. By a thing, I mean, following Langacker, the notion schematic for the animate being and the inanimate object. With this as background, we consider now the pairings of form and meaning characterized as exclusion passives.

If an intransitive event elaborates the Event in (34b), then the semantic structure of the exclusion passive is converted into a more specific one such as (35a). Similarly, if a transitive event is unified with the Event, a semantic structure like (35b) is yielded.

- (35) a. [[Y⇒]-X]
 b. [[Y⇒Z]-X]

Structures (35a) and (35b) correspond to the syntactic structures of the indirect passive with an intransitive verb in (36a) and the indirect passive with a transitive verb in (36b).

- (36) a. X-ga Y-ni V-rare-Tns
 b. X-ga Y-ni Z-o V-rare-Tns

Note that the agent corresponds to the NP marked with *-ni*, and the patient *Z*, if there is one, corresponds to the NP marked with *-o*.

¹⁷ Note that the line connecting the Event and Thing represents the relationship designated by *-rare-*. Also note that it is not necessary to assume that the conceptual unit Event in (34b) corresponds to a syntactic constituent, as Kuroda claims. Rather, it is assumed here that a passive clause, irrespective of whether it contains the *ni* or *ni yotte* phrase, is monoclausal in syntax, but biclausal in semantics (cf. Farmer 1984, Kitagawa 1986).

The inclusion passive designates a transitive event, represented here as $[Y \Rightarrow Z]$. A transitive event may be embodied by either the active or passive clause. In the active clause, the agent falls in subject position and the patient in object position. In the passive clause, on the other hand, the patient is in subject position, while the agent is either realized by an adjunct phrase (i.e. an NP marked with *-ni* or *-ni yotte*) or suppressed. Thus, the transitive event schema is associated with both the active form (37a) and the passive form (37b).

- (37) a. $[Y\text{-ga } X\text{-o } V\text{-Tns}]$
 b. $[X\text{-ga } (Y\text{-ni}) V\text{-rare-Tns}]$

The relation between the syntactic patterns (37a) and (37b) is not syntactic, but rather semantic. As Langacker (1987) argues, the distinction between subject and object is based on the difference in cognitive prominence between the entities involved in the relationship designated by the predicate. The more salient of two entities in a certain relation is mapped into subject, and the less salient into object. The former is called a "trajector" and the latter a "landmark." Thus the active form of a transitive verb has an agent and a patient for its trajector and landmark. The rule of passivization is then understood as the process of defocusing the agent and foregrounding the patient instead, as represented in (38).

- (38) $[Y_{tr} \Rightarrow X_{lm}] \rightarrow [Y \Rightarrow X_{tr}]$

Note that the agent Y in the semantic structure of the inclusion passive is an optional element, that is, located outside of the focus of predication when it is defocused. This is why the agent Y on the right-hand side of the arrow lacks the subscript. See also Shibatani (1985).

We are now in a position to give an account of the fact that it is only the inclusion passive that permits the missing agent and the *ni yotte* phrase. Since in the inclusion passive the agent is defocused and made an optional element, it may or may not be linguistically realized. The *ni yotte* phrase, as we shall see in section 7, is designed to serve as an adjunct, so that it is used only to elaborate an entity outside of the focus of predication, that is, to provide the context against the background of which the sentence is interpreted that contains it.

The inclusion passive is a semantic extension from the exclusion passive. Recall that inclusion passives are divided into two types, depending on whether they have an accusative object or not (i.e. *X-ga V-rare-Tns* vs. *X-ga Z-o V-rare-Tns*). Inclusion passives of the latter type are formally indistinguishable from exclusion passives of the same form, but they are distinguishable in terms of basic conceptual relations, in

the sense of Langacker (1987, § 6.2). A basic conceptual relation forms the basis for a more complex relation. An exclusion passive that has the form (36b) is associated with the semantic structure (35b), where X and Z are distinct from each other. On the other hand, an inclusion passive that has the same form is paired with a different semantic structure. In this case, as is clear from the discussion in section 5.1 (see especially (27b)), Z is included in, or part of, X . The semantic structure of inclusion passives of the type in question can be represented as in (39).

$$(39) [Y \Rightarrow [{}_x Z_{az} - X_{tr}]]$$

In this structure, Z designates the active zone, in the sense of Langacker, of X . This is indicated by the subscript "az." The term "active zone" is used to refer to those portions of an entity that participate directly and crucially in a given relation. As Langacker (1987:272–273) puts it, "entities are often multifaceted, only certain facets being able to interact with a particular domain or play a direct role in a particular relationship." The active zone may be realized formally, as in (27b), or left implicit, as in (27a). If the active zone remains latent in a semantic structure, the passive sentence paired with this semantic structure takes the form of the direct passive. Moreover, the semantic structure associated with the direct passive (i.e. the structure on the right-hand side of the formula in (38)) can be seen as a special case of (39), where the active zone Z is identical with, rather than included in, the trajector X .

To summarize, on my view, the inclusion passive is a grammatical construction extended from the exclusion passive. Thus, the inclusion passive should have a certain amount of syntactic and semantic properties inherited from the exclusion passive. For example, the inclusion passive permits *-ni* to mark the agentive phrase, just as the exclusion passive does. An inclusion passive is categorized as an extension from the exclusion passive, and thus shares certain semantic features, insofar as it contains agentive *-ni*. As a consequence, the *ni* passive emerges as an independent grammatical construction that is characterized as the pairing of a specific form and meaning.

In the next section, I will propose that the sense of spontaneity that is characteristic of the exclusion passive is carried over to the inclusion passive that has *-ni*, and this feature plays a role in distinguishing the *ni* passive from the *ni yotte* passive. In the course of discussion, it will be made clear that the *ni yotte* passive is paired with a different meaning which cannot be fully reduced to the meaning of its constituents. Particularly important is the fact that that meaning is motivated by the particle *-ni yotte* (for fuller discussion on the semantics of this particle, cf. § 7). In the light of

the meaning associated with the *ni yotte* passive, some unacceptable examples can be explained away (e.g. **Hanako-ga minna-ni yotte ais-are-ta* 'Hanako was loved by everyone').

6 A Constructional Approach to the *Ni* and the *Ni Yotte* Passive

The *ni* passive and the *ni yotte* passive are paired with different meanings: The meaning associated with the former is characterized by "spontaneity," and the meaning associated with the latter by the "causal linkage." It will become clear in the course of discussion that these meanings serve to distinguish the two types of passives.

6.1 "Spontaneity" as the Common Property of *Ni* Passives

The exclusion passive, as discussed in the last section, designates the relationship between an event and a person or thing. Since the person/thing corresponds to the passive subject, I will call it simply as the subject. In the relationship designated by an exclusion passive, the subject cannot exercise voluntary control over the event; rather, the subject just gets involved in the event.¹⁸ From the subject's point of view, then, the event that happens to it is an spontaneous occurrence. As Jacobsen (1992, chap. 5) argues, all grammatical constructions that characteristically contain the morpheme *-rare-* have in common the concept "spontaneous occurrence."¹⁹ For instance, in an exclusion passive *John-ga okusan-ni nige-rare-ta* 'John was deserted by his wife', the subject *John* is understood as involved in an event that happened of its own accord, that is, his wife's deserting him.

The point that requires clarification is that an event is said to be spontaneous from the viewpoint of the subject. To take the example discussed just above, John was deserted by his wife, which I claim is an spontaneous occurrence or simply accident like a spontaneous explosion from his point of view. But there could have been volition on his wife's part. She might well have planned to do so for years!

18 The term "involvement" here is notionally different from the same term used in Kuno (1983). Kuno seems to hold that the subject is characterized as "involved" if it refers to a participant of the action described by the verb, so that the subject is characteristically "involved" in the direct passive (e.g. *Kare-wa Hanako-ni but-are-ta* 'He was hit by someone') but "uninvolved" in the indirect passive (e.g. *Kare-wa kodomo-ni nak-are-ta* 'His child cried on him'). By contrast, in my view, every passive subject is understood as involved in a spontaneous occurrence.

19 As is well known, the suffix *-rare-* has multiple functions. It functions as the overt indication of the spontaneous, potential, and honorific constructions, in addition to the marker of the passive voice (cf. Jacobsen 1992, chap. 5; see also Shibatani 1985).

Similarly, in an exclusion passive such as *John-ga koibito-ni kubi-o tur-are-ta* 'John is such that his girlfriend hung herself', John's girlfriend is understood as having committed suicide, which is nothing but an accident beyond his control. The notion of spontaneity is critically involved in the meaning of exclusion passives.

With this as background, we turn now to the semantics of inclusion passives. Since the inclusion passive can be characterized as an extension from the exclusion passive, as discussed in section 4, the former has some syntactic and semantic properties inherited from the latter (for extensive discussion of inheritance, see Goldberg 1995, Lakoff 1987, Norvig and Lakoff 1987, among others). Included in such properties is the notion of spontaneity, as well as the syntactic configuration *NP-ga NP-ni . . . V-rare-Tns*. For example, the inclusion passive *John-ga kuruma-ni hik-are-ta* 'John was run over by a car' makes use of the same syntactic configuration as the exclusion passive *John-ga okusan-ni nige-rare-ta*. Note that the car accident John had can be seen as an spontaneous occurrence. It is improbable that he planned or arranged to have a car accident. Thus, spontaneity is also involved in the meaning of inclusion passives.

At this point, the objection will no doubt be raised that in some cases, the passive subject can be interpreted as volitional. As is well-known, adverbs like *wazato* 'intentionally' may occur in a passive sentence (cf. Makino 1972; for discussion of a similar phenomenon in English, see Jackendoff 1972, § 3.9), as shown in (40a).

- (40) a. *Mary-ga wazato Joe-ni yuuwakus-are-ta.*
 M.-Nom intentionally J.-Dat seduce-Pass-Past
 'Mary intentionally has been seduced by Joe.'
- b. **Mary-wa wazato Joe-ni but-are-ta.*
 M.-Nom intentionally J.-Dat hit-Pass-Past
 'Mary intentionally has been hit by Joe.'

Admittedly, *Mary* is understood as having had the intention of being seduced by Joe, nonetheless I would suggest that spontaneity is even involved in this example, because it is Joe, not Mary, who decided to seduce her. In other words, she happened to be seduced by Joe as she had intended to. Thus, Joe's having seduced Mary is still a spontaneous occurrence. Moreover, not every passive occurs with *wazato*. For example, it is extremely hard to invoke a context in which a passive sentence like (40b) becomes natural. Full discussion of this grammatical phenomenon is beyond the scope of this paper, but for the time being let us say that verb meaning is involved in determining whether or not the adverb is allowed to occur in a passive sentence.

The subject of the inclusion passive is typically occupied by an NP that is construed as the patient of a transitive event. Generally, the inclusion passive is consonant with the transitive event. Transitivity is a matter of degree (cf. Hopper and Thompson 1980, Lakoff 1987, Rice 1987, Taylor 1989, among others). The inclusion passive gets better in proportion to the transitivity of the verb's involved in it. Rice (1987) makes an attempt to explore the prototype of transitivity in terms of conceptual categories such as "contact," "directionality," "opposition," etc. Thus, the inclusion passive typically contains a verb of physical contact (e.g. *but-* 'hit', *ker-* 'kick', *sawar-* 'touch', etc.); it also permits a physical contact verb that takes a dative object, rather than an accusative object (e.g. *kamituk-* 'to bite', *butukar-* 'to hit against', *dakituk-* 'to throw one's arms around', etc.).

It should be noted that such verbs are allowed to occur with the *ni* phrase, but with the *ni yotte* phrase, in a passive clause. For example, both of the following inclusion passives would be judged unacceptable if the *-ni* on the agent NP *Hanako* is replaced with *-ni yotte*, although the inclusion passive per se allows both of the *-ni* and *-ni yotte* phrases:²⁰

- (41) a. Taroo-ga Hanako-ni but-are-ta.
 T.-Nom H.-Dat hit-Pass-Past
 'Taro was hit by Hanako.'
 b. Taroo-wa inu-ni kamituk-are-ta.
 T.-Nom dog-Dat bite-Pass-Past
 'Taro was bitten by the dog.'

A question arises as to why *-ni yotte* cannot be used instead of *-ni* in these passive sentences. This question can be restated as follows: Why does the *ni yotte* passive permit a verb such as *but-* or *kamituk-*? It is this question to which we turn now.

6.2 Causal Linkage, Contingency, and the Distinction of Ni and Ni Yotte Passives

Verbs of creative activity (*sekkeis-* 'design', *kensetus-* 'build', etc.) and aspectual verbs (e.g. *hazime-* 'begin', *tuzuke-* 'continue', etc.) occur only in the *ni yotte* passive (cf. Sunakawa 1984, Teramura 1984, among others):

²⁰ It should be noted that physical contact is not a necessary element for the verbs that are licensed in the *ni* passive. The transitive verbs *sonkeis-* 'to respect', *ais-* 'to love', and *kiraw-* 'to hate', as well as the dative verbs *tikayor-* 'to approach', *iiyor-* 'to force one's attention on', and *ayamar-* 'to apologize' are also allowed to occur in this grammatical construction.

- (42) Teikoku Hōteru-wa Raito{**-ni/-ni yotte*} sekkeis-are-ta. (Kamio 1989)
 Imperial Hotel-Top Wright{**-Dat/-BY*} design-Pass-Past
 'The Imperial Hotel was designed by Wright.'
- (43) Kaikai-ga gityoo{**-ni/-ni yotte*} sengens-are-ta. (Inoue 1976)
 opening-Nom chairman{**-Dat/-BY*} declare-Pass-Past
 'The opening of the meeting was declared by the chairman.'

These examples suggest that the subject of the *ni yotte* passive is constrained to designate something that is completely dependent upon the agent of the action described by the verb. For instance, the Imperial Hotel would not exist in the present form if Frank Lloyd Wright hadn't worked out a design for it (cf. (42)). Similarly, the opening of a meeting is due to the chairman's declaration (cf. (43)). One might say that a meeting begins if someone else declares the opening. I would like to reply that the person who did the declaration in this case happened to play the role of chairman in the meeting. It is essential to notice that the opening of the meeting is causally linked to the act of declaring it, rather than the role of chairman. It should be clear that the *ni yotte* passive has in its meaning the relation "the theme exists by virtue of the agent's having done something," where the terms "agent" and "theme" stand for the referents of the nominal marked with *-ni yotte* and the passive subject, respectively. Let us refer to this relation as the causal linkage between the agent and theme.

Given that the *ni yotte* passive designates the causal linkage between the agent and theme, we could account for the unacceptability of the *ni yotte* passives in (41), where the theme is Taro and the agent is Hanako or a dog. In these *ni yotte* passives, Taro is not understood as being existentially dependent upon the agent's activity (i.e. Hanako's hitting him or the dog's biting him). Similarly, we can give an account of the fact that *-ni yotte* cannot be used in the passive of perception verbs (e.g. **Bill-ga John-ni yotte mi-rare-ta* 'Bill was seen by John'), the passive of psychological state verbs (e.g. **Mary-ga minna-ni yotte ais-are-te i-ru* 'Mary is loved by everyone'), and the indirect passive (e.g. **John-ga okusan-ni yotte nige-rare-ta* 'John was deserted by his wife'). These passives contain the verb that describes a self-contained action. It is unlikely that a person or thing is due to such an action. Moreover, a self-contained action does not have any perceptible effect on the entities external to it. For instance, there could be no man that exists by virtue of his wife's having left him. Because of the causal linkage implied by *-ni yotte*, the types of passives adduced above are judged anomalous; they are somehow constrained to occur with the *ni* phrase.

The *ni* passive is incompatible with the causal linkage between the agent and theme. This is so because, I believe, it has a connotation of contingency. Recall that the *ni* passive has as its hallmark the sense of spontaneity. The *ni* passive designates the relationship between a person/thing and a spontaneous occurrence. It should be noted that what is characterized as a spontaneous occurrence here is accidental and thus could happen many times. The *ni* passive in (41a), for instance, suggests that even if Taro had not been hit by Hanako, he might well be hit by some other person. Similarly for (41b).

When we take the connotation of contingency into account, the unacceptability of the *ni* passives in (42)–(43) can be accounted for in the following way: These passives give rise to a semantic anomaly. The *ni* passive in (42), for instance, implies that the Imperial Hotel would look the same even if it had not been designed by Frank Lloyd Wright. It is absurd to assume that everyone has the potential for creating the same object, rather than an object of the same type, as Wright did. The relationship between a creator to the things created is not transient, but immutable.

The subject of the *ni yotte* passive is causally or existentially linked to the agent and the agent's activity, and this causal linkage is immutable rather than transient. The subject of the *ni* passive, on the other hand, is accidentally involved in a spontaneous occurrence. With this as background, we turn now to the contrast we have observed in the previous section between the direct passive *Ryoosyu-no yasiki-ga murabito-tati-ni yotte tate-rare-te i-ru* 'A house is built for the lord by the villagers' and the indirect passive *?*Ryoosyu-ga murabito-tati-ni yotte yasiki-o tate-rare-te i-ru* 'The lord is built a house by the villagers'. Although both of these passives are intended to describe the same situation, there is a clear contrast in acceptability between them. The reason for this contrast is that the construal of the direct passive is consonant with the *ni yotte* passive, whereas the construal of the indirect passive is not. Note that it is not the lord, but his house, that is being built.

We encounter difficulties, however, when we make an attempt to deal with the verbs that are allowed to occur in both the *ni* and the *ni yotte* passive (e.g. *koros*- 'kill', *hakais*- 'destroy', and *tasuke*- 'help', etc.). As we have observed, both the *ni* passives and the *ni yotte* passives in (44) are acceptable.

- (44) a. Daitooryoo-ga CIA{-ni/-ni yotte} koros-are-ta.
 b. John-ga Bill{-ni/-ni yotte} tasuke-rare-ta.
 c. Ano mati-wa Nihongun{-ni/-ni yotte} hakais-are-ta.

Some of the speakers I consulted with said that there is no difference between the *ni* and *ni yotte* passive forms, and others judged the *ni* passive forms more appropriate

than the *ni yotte* passive forms. In my judgement the *ni yotte* passives are, though by no means unacceptable, less natural than the *ni* passives; they sound like slight exaggerations. To be sure, each of these pairs is different in meaning, but I have not been able to pinpoint the distinguishing factor(s). My tentative strategy is to treat each of these *ni* and *ni yotte* passives in the same way as the other examples we have considered so far. For instance, the verb *hakais-* 'destroy' fits in with both the *ni* and the *ni yotte* passive: With the *ni* phrase, (44c) implies that the destruction of the city by the Japanese Army was a kind of accident; with the *ni yotte* phrase, on the other hand, the passive describes the causal relation of the Japanese Army's activity to the ruined city.

6.3 Summary

The main point of my argument, in short, is to distinguish the *ni* and the *ni yotte* passive in terms of the meanings associated with them. The *ni* passive is paired with the semantic feature "spontaneity," which, as I have demonstrated, implies the sense of contingency or accident. The *ni yotte* passive, on the other hand, designates the causal linkage between the agent's activity and the theme's appearance (or disappearance). This approach to the *ni/ni yotte* distinction is similar to the approach taken in Kamio (1989), who claims that the subject of the *ni yotte* passive is understood as affected in a structural manner, whereas the subject of the *ni* passive is understood as affected in either structural or phenomenal manner. However, there seems to be a slight difference between his analysis and mine. Kamio, like Kuroda, attributes the semantic difference between the two types of passives to the difference between homonymous passive morphemes. A more credible hypothesis, I believe, is that each type of the passive construction is paired with its inherent meaning, and this meaning is not reduced to any constituent part.

A *ni* passive, whether it is an inclusion or exclusion passive, has the sense of spontaneity, which I claim is inherited from the exclusion passive to the inclusion passive. In other words, the meaning of the inclusion passive is motivated by the meaning of the exclusion passive. Note that spontaneity cannot be reduced to any constituent part. For example, the passive morpheme *-rare-* per se does not have this semantic feature, since it appears in the reduced passive, which is neutral concerning the *ni/ni yotte* distinction. The sense of spontaneity is thus the semantic feature associated with the form of the *ni* passive.

The causal linkage designated by the *ni yotte* passive cannot be reduced to the meaning of its constituents, either. It is clear that the *ni yotte* phrase does not evoke the causal linkage in isolation from other elements of the sentence in which it ap-

pears. Rather, this specific construal of the relationship between the agent and the theme is possible only if it is paired with the syntactic configuration characterized as the *ni yotte* passive. It should be emphasized here that I am claiming that the meaning of the *ni yotte* passive as a whole is not predicted by the meaning of the complex particle *-ni yotte*. In the next section, we will see that the *ni yotte* passive is semantically motivated by this particle.

7 The Emergence of the Complex Particle *-Ni Yotte*

The complex particle *-ni yotte*, if used in a passive clause, marks the logical subject of the verb, which typically designates the agent. In the last section, we have suggested that the *ni yotte* passive is motivated by this particle to designate what we call the "causal linkage." In this section, we will discuss that this usage emerges from other usages.

7.1 The Verb *Yor-*

The particle *-ni yotte* is historically derived from the combination of the dative particle *-ni* and the verb *yor-* followed by the suffix *-te*, and inherited some of the syntactic and semantic properties from this verb. The verb *yor-* has the meaning 'to draw near something' or 'to drop in on someone':

- (45) Oookina inu-ga watasi-no soba-ni yot-te ki-ta.
 big dog-Nom I-Gen vicinity-Dat yor-Ger come-Past
 'A big dog came up to me.'

It may also designate the cause–effect and/or means–end relation between two events.

- (46) a. Sakuban-no kazi-wa tabako-no husimatu-ni yor-u mono-dat-ta.
 last night-Gen fire-Top cigarette-Gen carelessness-Dat yor-Pres thing-Cop-Past
 'A fire broke out last night because someone did take enough care in putting out a cigarette.'
- b. Sono mondai-no kaiketu-wa tetteitekina hanasiai-ni yor-u.
 the problem-Gen solution-Top thorough discussion-Dat yor-Pres
 'The problem is solved by discussing it thoroughly.'

The nominative subject refers to the effect or end, and the dative object the cause or means. This use of *yor-* might well be a metaphorical extension from the spatial use in (45). Someone's approaching something results in contiguity. The notion "contiguity" may well be metaphorically mapped into the relationship between two events.

It is clear that the use of the verb *yor-* in (46) forms the basis for the complex

particle *-ni yotte*. The construction made up of the dative particle *-ni*, the verb *yor-*, and the suffix *-te* becomes a complex particle through grammaticalization. The term "grammaticalization" refers to processes whereby a content word assumes the grammatical characteristics of a function word.²¹ Thus, the verb *yor-* is said to be grammaticalized when it becomes more particle-like. Note that it is not only the verb but also the elements preceding and following it that are turned into a single particle, which results from reanalyzing the phrase $[[X-ni] yot-te]$ as $[X-[ni yot-te]]$. "Quite often what is grammaticalized is not a single content word but an entire construction that includes that word" (Hopper and Traugott 1993:4).

As *-ni yotte* becomes a particle, it inherits some syntactic and semantic properties from the original verb. *Yor-* as a verb has an event both for its subject and its object. The subject designates the caused event, and the object the causing event. By contrast, *-ni yotte* marks an NP designating the causing event, and the clause that it modifies designates the caused event. In short, the subject of the original verb corresponds to the clause that the *ni yotte* phrase modifies, as schematically represented in (47).

(47) [s . . . [NP₂-*ni yotte*] . . .]



[NP₁-*ga*] [NP₂-*ni yor-Tns*]

7.2 Agent, Instrument, and Cause/Mean

The complex particle *-ni yotte* is used to mark the NP that designates the logical subject of the verb in a passive clause. It may also be used to mark the NP that designates the cause or means, as in (48a), and the NP that designates the instrument, as in (48b), in reference to the event described by the sentence in which it appears.²²

21 Words or morphemes are divided into two classes: One class contains content words or lexical items, which are used to designate entities, that is, things or relations (e.g. verbs, nouns, adjectives, etc.), and the other contains functional or grammatical words, which serve to indicate the relationships between those entities (e.g. prepositions, connectives, pronouns, demonstratives, etc.).

22 The particle *-ni yotte* need not follow an NP. It may also be attached to a *koto* clause. The italicized nominals in (48a) and (48b) can be replaced with *tabako-o kitinto simatusi-nakat-ta koto* 'that someone didn't take enough care in putting out a cigarette' and *konpyuutaa-o tuka-u koto* 'that someone uses the computer'. With instrumental *-ni yotte*, the subject of the *koto* clause is coreferential with the matrix subject.

(48) a. *Cause*

Sakuban, *tabako-no husimatu-ni yotte kazi-ga hasseisi-ta.*

last night cigarette-Gen carelessness-BY fire-Nom happen-Past

'A fire broke out last night because someone didn't take enough care in putting out a cigarette.'

b. *Instrument*

Taroo-wa *konpyuutaa-ni yotte angoo-o toi-ta.*

T.-Top computer-BY code-Acc decipher-Past

'Taro deciphered the code by the computer.'

In each of these sentences, the *ni yotte* phrase functions as the adverbial or adjunct modifying the main clause. It is optional, and may be deleted without rendering the sentence unintelligible. Thus, the action or process described by the main clause is in the focus of predication, and bears the role of effect or purpose in relation to the *ni yotte* phrase, regardless of whether it denotes the cause, means, or instrument. The *ni yotte* phrase, then, elaborates a part of the context against the background of which the main clause is interpreted (cf. Langacker 1987, chap. 6).

Note that the *ni yotte* phrase in (48a) would be understood as the means if it appears in a different clause. The notions of cause, means, and instrument are similar in that they are pertinent to the event that causes another event. A cause, for instance, can be defined as a person, thing, or event that makes something happen, and a means as a way to an end. The cause and means are conceptually the two sides of the same coin, as is clear from the fact that the roles of the propositions "John got grade A" and "John studied hard" are the same in the sentence *John got grade A, as he studied hard*, as they are in *John studies hard to get grade A*. An instrument is a thing that is used to do some task or achieve a particular objective. Thus it may be presumed that the notions of cause, means, and instrument all designate an entity that creates the potential for the desired effect.

Agentive *-ni yotte* resembles causative *-ni yotte* and instrumental *-ni yotte*, because it designates the person or thing that causes something to happen or exist or the person who causes something not to happen or exist. Thus the agentive *ni* phrase refers to the person who bears responsibility for the situation described by the passive clause in which it appears. For example, the sentence *Teikoku Hoteru-wa Raito-ni sekkeis-are-ta* 'The Imperial Hotel was designed by Wright' suggests that Frank Lloyd Wright is responsible for the form of the Imperial Hotel; similarly, *Daitooryoo-ga CIA-ni yotte koros-are-ta* 'The president was killed by the CIA' suggests that CIA is responsible for the death of the president. In other words, the Im-

perial Hotel would now look different had it not been for Wright; the president would be alive if the CIA hadn't done an imprudent act.

The sense of responsibility can also be extracted from the meaning of instrumental *-ni yotte*. The instrumental *ni yotte* phrase implies that the person referred to by the subject is able to achieve his objective only by using the instrument it refers to. In contrast with this particle, instrumental *-de* lacks such an implication. Thus, an NP that can be marked with instrumental *-ni yotte* can also be marked with instrumental *-de*, not vice versa. Compare (49a)–(49b) with (48b).

- (49) a. Taroo-wa konpyuutaa-de angoo-o toi-ta.
 T.-Top computer-Loc code-Acc decipher-Past
 'Taro deciphered the code on the computer.'
- b. Taroo-wa waapuro{-de/*-ni yotte} genkoo-o kai-ta.
 T.-Top word processor{-Loc/-BY} manuscript-Acc write-Past
 'Taro wrote a manuscript on the word processor.'

To have some idea of the difference between instrumental *-ni yotte* and *-de*, let us compare (48b) with (49b). A computer is specifically designed for problem solving, while the word processor is just a convenient tool for typing a manuscript. Thus, (48b) not only states that Taro managed to decipher a code on the computer, but implies that he was not able to do so without the machine. By contrast, (49b) does not imply that Taro couldn't write a manuscript on anything but the word processor. Clearly, he could do the same thing by hand.

Agentive *-ni yotte* and instrumental *-ni yotte* are sometimes difficult to distinguish from each other. To take an example discussed in Kuroda (1979, note 14), the *-ni yotte* of *Amerika-no zinkooisei-ni yotte* 'by American satellites' in the following example is hard to identify as an agentive or instrumental *-ni yotte*:

- (50) Rosia-wa Amerika-no zinkooisei-ni yotte guntai-no idoo-o
 Russia-Top America-Gen satellite-BY troop-Gen movement-Acc
 kansis-are-te i-ru.
 observe-Pass-Ger be-Pres
 'Russia is such that American satellites are observing the movements of its troops.'

The *ni yotte* phrase here has a striking similarity to the one in (48b); it implies that the information about the movements of Russian troops would not be available to the United States were it not for the satellites.

The reason that *-ni yotte* indicates a causal linkage in a passive clause is that the

verb *yor-*, from which it is developed historically, designates the cause–effect or means–end relation. It is reasonable to assume that the construction, *-ni + yor- + -te*, is grammaticalized to causative *-ni yotte*, which in turn provides the basis for instrumental and agentive *-ni yotte*'s. All of the usages are similar to each other in that in each case, *-ni yotte* designates an entity pertinent to the event causing another event. Causative *-ni yotte* marks the NP referring to the causing event as a whole, while instrumental or agentive *-ni yotte* marks the NP referring to a participant of the causing event. The caused event, on the other hand, is designated by the clause that it modifies.

8 Concluding Remarks

Every language has a number of constructions at various level of organization. Some constructions are similar to others in structure, meaning, and/or function. It is also likely that languages are similar with respect to certain grammatical phenomena. The passive construction is a case in point. The passive usually has the active counterpart in a language, as well as similar constructions in other languages. These facts have motivated linguists to set up a theory to account for relevant facts in a uniform way. The Japanese *ni yotte* passive has been treated in the same way as the English *be* passive on the grounds that it is no less objective than its active counterpart. What I have demonstrated in this paper is that this strategy may fail to capture the properties that are specific to the construction itself. As we have discussed, the *ni* passive and the *ni yotte* passive have different meanings associated with them. Such meanings are motivated by some factors. Those factors, in my opinion, can only be picked out by the investigation usages of the construction and their relationships.

References

- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Farmer, Ann Kathleen. 1984. *Modularity in Syntax: A Study of Japanese and English*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Fillmore, Charles J., and Paul Kay. 1993. *Construction Grammar Coursebook*. Berkeley, Calif.: Copy Central.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Howard, Irwin, and Agnes M. Niyekawa-Howard. 1976. Passivization. In *Japanese Generative Grammar*, ed. Masayoshi Shibatani, 201–237. New York: Academic Press.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language*

- 56:251–299.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoshi, Hiroto. 1991. The Generalized Projection Principle and Its Implications for Passive Constructions. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 13:53–89.
- Inoue, Kazuko. 1976. *Henkei bunpoo to Nihongo, zyoo: Toogo koozoo o tyuusin ni*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jacobsen, Wesley M. 1992. *The Transitive Structure of Events in Japanese*. Tokyo: Kurocio Publishers.
- Kamio, Akio. 1989. A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis of the Japanese Passive. In *Zyudoo Koobun no Kenkyuu*, ed. Takeo Saito, 91–112. The Institute of Modern Languages and Cultures, University of Tsukuba.
- Kinsui, Satoshi. 1991. Zyudoobun no rekisi ni tuite no iti koosatu. *Kokugogaku* 164:1–14.
- Kirsner, Robert S. 1977. On the Passive of Sensory Verb Complement Sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.1:173–179.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1986. Subjects in Japanese and English. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1983. *Sin Nihon bunpoo kenkyuu*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 1965. Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language. Ph.D. Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 1979. On Japanese Passives. In *Explorations in Linguistics: Papers in Honor of Kazuko Inoue*, ed. George Bedell, Eichi Kobayashi, and Masatake Muraki, 305–347. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 1, *Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Concept, Image, and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 2, *Descriptive Application*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Makino, Seiichi. 1972. Adverbial Scope and the Passive Construction in Japanese. *Papers in Linguistics* 5:73–98.
- Makino, Seiichi, and Michio Tsutsui. 1986. *A Dictionary of Basic Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: The

- Japan Times.
- Makino, Seiichi, and Michio Tsutsui. 1995. *A Dictionary of Intermediate Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.
- McCawley, James D. 1988. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*, 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCawley, Noriko Akatsuka. 1972. On the Treatment of Japanese Passives. In *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, ed. P. M. Peranteau, et. al., 259–270. Chicago: Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1989. *Structure and Case Marking in Japanese*. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.
- Norvig, Peter, and George Lakoff. 1987. Talking: A Study in Lexical Network Theory. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, ed. Jon Aske, et. al., 195–206. Berkeley, Calif.: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Oehrle, Richard T., and Hiroko Nishio. 1981. Adversity. In *Coyote Papers: Working Papers in Linguistics from A → Z*, Vol. 2, ed. Ann Kathleen Farmer and Chisato Kitagawa, 163–185. University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Perlmutter, David. ed. 1983. *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rice, Sally. 1987. Towards a Cognitive Model of Transitivity. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, San Diego.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. Passives and Related Constructions: A Prototype Analysis. *Language* 61:821–848.
- Sunakawa, Yuriko. 1984. "Ni ukemibun" to "niyotte ukemibun". *Nihongogaku* 3.7:76–87.
- Taylor, John R. 1989. *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Teramura, Hideo. 1984. *Nihongo no sintakusu to imi 1*. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Washio, Ryuichi. 1990. The Japanese Passive. *The Linguistic Review* 6:227–263.
- Washio, Ryuichi. 1993. When Causatives Mean Passive: A Cross-linguistic Perspective. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 2:45–90.
- Washio, Ryuichi. 1995. *Interpreting Voice: A Case Study in Lexical Semantics*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Wierzbicka, Ann. 1988. *The Semantics of Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Doctoral Program in Literature and Linguistics
University of Tsukuba