

A Note on *Te Moraw* Sentences*

Shinsuke Homma

0. Introduction

In this paper I examine the syntactic structure of so-called *te moraw* (henceforth, TM) sentences in Japanese. I present some pieces of empirical evidence that there are two different syntactic derivations for two types of TM sentences that are distinguished semantically.¹

1. *Te Moraw* Sentences and Passive Sentences

Sugimoto (1985) and Terada (1990) observe the significant parallelism between passive and TM sentences. Consider the following paradigm:

(1) a. Direct Passive:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni home-rare-ta
Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT praise-PASS-PAST
'Hanako was praised by Taro'

b. Possessive Passive:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni kodomo-o home-rare-ta
Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT child-ACC praise-PASS-PAST
'Hanako had her child praised by Taro'

c. Indirect (adversative) Passive:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni deteik-are-ta
Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT 'go out'-PASS-PAST
'Hanako had Taro go out (and it was adversity for her)'

Several linguists have pointed out syntactic differences between Direct Passive and Possessive Passive on one hand and Indirect Passive on the other.² As one piece of such evidence, they have pointed out that the dative particle of the NP that is understood as the Agent of the verb can

alternate with a postposition *niyotte* ('by') or *kara* ('from') only in Direct and Possessive Passives:

(4) a. Direct Passive:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni/-niyotte/-kara home-rare-ta

b. Possessive Passive:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni/-niyotte/-kara kodomo-o home-rare-ta

c. Indirect Passive:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni/*-niyotte/*-kara deteik-are-ta

We can make corresponding TM sentences with the above three predicates that induce Direct Passive, Possessive Passive, and Indirect Passive, respectively:

(5) a. 'Direct' TM:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni home-te moraw-ta

Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT praise-TE receive-PAST

'Hanako had herself praised by Taro'

b. 'Possessive' TM:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni kodomo-o home-te moraw-ta

Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT child-ACC praise-TE receive-PAST

'Hanako had her child praised by Taro'

c. 'Indirect' TM:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni deteik-te moraw-ta

Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT 'go out'-TE receive-PAST

'Hanako had Taro go out'

Sugimoto and Terada observe that the dative particle *-ni* can alternate with the postposition *-kara* only in Direct and Possessive TMs:

(6) a. Direct TM:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni/-kara home-te moraw-ta

b. Possessive TM:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni/-kara kodomo-o home-te moraw-ta

c. Indirect TM:

Hanako-ga Taroo-ni/*-kara deteik-te moraw-ta

Terada has also pointed out the parallel syntactic categorial difference of NP-*ni*'s in the above types of passives and TMs by showing whether NP-*ni* can be the antecedent of *zibun* ('x-self'):³

(7) Direct Passive and TM:

a. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_i/*_j-no heya-de
 Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT self-of room-LOC
 home-rare-ta
 praise-PASS-PAST

'Hanako was praised by Taro in self's room'

b. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_i/*_j-no heya-de
 Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT self-of room-LOC
 home-te moraw-ta
 praise-TE receive-PAST

'Hanako had herself praised by Taro in self's room'

(8) Possessive Passive and TM:

a. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_i/*_j-no heya-de
 Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT self-of room-LOC
 kodomo-o home-rare-ta
 child-ACC praise-PASS-PAST

'Hanako had her child praised by Taro in self's room'

b. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_i/*_j-no heya-de
 Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT self-of room-LOC
 kodomo-o home-te moraw-ta
 child-ACC praise-TE receive-PAST

'Hanako had her child praised by Taro in self's room'

(9) Indirect Passive and TM:

a. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_i/_j-no heya-kara
 Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT self-of room-from

deteik-are-ta

'go out'-PASS-PAST

'Hanako had Taro go out of self's room'

- b. Hanako_i-ga Taro_j-ni zibun_{i/j}-no heya-kara
 Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT self-of room-LOC
 deteik-te moraw-ta
 'go out'-TE receive-PAST
 'Hanako had Taro go out of self's room'

These syntactic differences have led Terada (1990) to propose two types of derivations for TM sentences (See Section 3.).

2. Passive and Causative Meaning of TM Sentences

Before examining the syntax of TM sentences, it is worth while considering their semantics. Consider the TM sentences in (5) again:

- (5) a. Direct TM:

Hanako-ga Taro_j-ni home-te moraw-ta

- b. Possessive TM:

Hanako-ga Taro_j-ni kodomo-o home-te moraw-ta

- c. Indirect TM:

Hanako-ga Taro_j-ni deteik-te moraw-ta

We notice that the natural interpretation for (5a) is the one just like that of its passive counterpart: Hanako had herself praised by Taro without asking him to praise her. The same is true of (5b), its natural interpretation being that Hanako had her child praised by Taro without asking him to praise him. We can see this from the following examples:

- (10) a. Hanako-ga omoigakezu Taro_j-ni home-te
 Hanako-NOM 'without expectation' Taro-DAT praise-TE
 moraw-ta
 receive-PAST

'Hanako had herself praised by Taro without any expectation'

- b. Hanako-ga omoigakezu Taroo-ni kodomo-o
 Hanako-NOM 'without expectation' Taro-DAT child-ACC
 home-te moraw-ta
 praise-TE receive-PAST

'Hanako had her child praised by Taro without any expectation'

The Indirect TM sentence in (5c) yields a significantly different interpretation in this regard. Its natural reading is comparable to that of the causative sentence in (11):

- (11) Hanako-ga Taroo-ni/-o deteik-ase-ta
 Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT/-ACC 'go out'-CAUS-PAST
 'Hanako made/let Taro go out (of the house)'

We can see this from the ungrammaticality of the following sentence:

- (12) *Hanako-ga omoigakezu Taroo-ni deteik-te
 Hanako-NOM 'without expectation' Taro-DAT 'go out'-TE
 moraw-ta
 receive-PAST
 'Hanako had Taro go out without expectation'

The adverb *omoigakezu* cannot occur in an Indirect TM sentence since it is impossible for an agent causer to cause an event by asking someone without any expectation or intention of doing so.⁴ The adverb *muriyari* ('forcibly'), on the other hand, is compatible with a causative meaning of an Indirect TM sentence:

- (13) Hanako-ga muriyari Taroo-ni deteik-te moraw-ta
 Hanako-NOM forcibly Taro-DAT 'go out'-TE receive-PAST
 'Hanako forcibly had Taro go out'

Notice that Direct and Possessive TM sentences are potentially ambiguous between a passive and a causative interpretation. The following examples with the adverb *muriyari* show that these two types of TM sentence could also have a causative meaning. Consider:

(14) a. Direct TM:

Hanako-ga muriyari Taroo-ni home-te moraw-ta
 Hanako-NOM forcibly Taro-DAT praise-TE receive-PAST
 'Hanako forcibly had Taro praise her'

b. Possessive TM:

Hanako-ga muriyari Taroo-ni kodomo-o home-te
 Hanako-NOM forcibly Taro-DAT child-ACC praise-TE
 moraw-ta
 receive-PAST
 'Hanako forcibly had Taro praise her child'

The adverb in the above examples forces a causative meaning: it must be the case that Hanako asks Taro to praise her or her child in order for each of these sentences to be true, although these sentences sound pragmatically somewhat odd since in reality few people dare to ask anyone to praise them or their own children.⁵ Such pragmatic oddness is removed in such sentences as follows:

(15) a. sono-kodomo-ga muriyari hahaoya-ni
 that-child-NOM forcibly mother-DAT
 dakkosi-te moraw-ta
 'carry-in-arms'-TE receive-PAST

'The child forcibly had his mother carry him in her arms'

b. Hanako-ga muriyari Taroo-ni hana-ni kisusi-te
 Hanako-NOM forcibly Taro-DAT nose-DAT kiss-TE
 moraw-ta
 receive-PAST

'Hanako forcibly had Taro kiss her on the nose'

It is interesting to observe that the dative particle *-ni* cannot alternate with the postposition *-kara* if a Direct or a Possessive TM sentence bears a causative meaning. Compare (16) with (15):

- (16) a. *sono-kodomo-ga muriyari hahaoya-kara dakkosi-te
moraw-ta
b. *Hanako-ga muriyari Taroo-kara hana-ni kisusi-te
moraw-ta

Moreover, the dative NP can serve as the antecedent of *zibun* in the complement clause of *moraw* if we force (7b) and (8b) to bear a causative sense by adding *muriyari* to them. Consider:

- (17) a. Hanako_i-ga muriyari Taro_j-ni zibun_{i/j}-no heya-de
home-te moraw-ta
'Hanako forcibly had Taro praise her in self's room'
b. Hanako_i-ga muriyari Taro_j-ni zibun_{i/j}-no heya-de
kodomo-o home-te moraw-ta
'Hanako forcibly had Taro praise her child in self's
room'

These observations suggest that there is a syntactic difference between those TM sentences with a passive sense and those with a causative sense. In the following sections I show some pieces of empirical evidence for the derivational differences between the passive and the causative TM constructions.

3. Syntax of the TM Constructions

The syntactic differences that we saw in Section 1 between the Direct and the Possessive TM constructions on one hand and the Indirect TM construction on the other have led Terada (1990) to assign different syntactic derivations to these different types of TM constructions. In this section I give some pieces of empirical support for her analysis of the TM constructions and add that the Direct and the Possessive TM construc-

tions, which we observe are semantically ambiguous, must also be syntactically ambiguous.

3.1 Derivational Difference

Based on the syntactic differences we saw in Section 1, Terada (1990) has proposed to assign the following syntactic derivation to the TM constructions, assuming two different argument structures of the verb *moraw*:

- (18) *moraw* <Benefactive, Event (Theme)>
<Agent (Causer), Theme (Causee), Event>

(19) Derivations of Direct and Possessive TM's:

- a. [IP [NP<Benefactive> Hanako_i-ga] [VP [CP<Event> [IP *PRO*_i [VP [pp Taroo-ni/-kara] [vp *t*_i home-] te]] moraw-] ta]]
 b. [IP [NP<Benefactive> Hanako_i-ga] [VP [CP<Event> [IP *PRO*_i [VP [pp Taroo-ni/-kara] [vp *t*_i kodomo-o home-] te]] moraw-] ta]]⁶

(20) Derivation of Indirect TM:

- [IP [NP<Agent-Causer> Hanako-ga [VP [NP<Causee> Taroo_i-ni] [CP<Event> [IP *PRO*_i [vp deteik-] te]] moraw-] ta]]

In (19), "passivization" applies in the complement clause and *PRO* is moved to a position to avoid being governed by V.⁷ The moved *PRO* then is controlled by the matrix subject NP.⁸ The agent role of the embedded verb is demoted and is assigned to the adjunct PP (NP-*ni/-kara*). In (20), on the other hand, the matrix verb takes three arguments; the matrix subject, the matrix dative NP, and the complement clause. The embedded null subject *PRO* is controlled by the dative NP in the matrix clause (cf. Arisaka *et al.* (1992)).^{9, 10}

Below I provide pieces of empirical evidence for assigning the syntactic representations in (19) and (20) to the Direct and the Possessive TM on one hand and the Indirect TM on the other, respec-

tively. I show further that the causative Direct and Possessive TM's have the object-control structure as in (20).

3.2 Empirical Evidence

3.2.1 Local Anaphor

It has been observed that a Japanese reflexive *zibunzisin* can only take the clause-mate subject NP as its antecedent (Katada (1991) among others):

- (21) Kazue_i-ga [Hanako_j-ga Taroo_k-ni zibunzisin*_{i/j/*k}-no
 Kazue-NOM Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT self-of-
 syasin-o mise-ta-to] omow-te iru
 picture-ACC show-PAST-COMP believe-TE be-PRES
 'Kazue believes that Hanako showed Taro a picture of self'

A relevant generalization may be stated as follows:

- (23) *Zibunzisin* must be bound in its governing category.¹¹

If the proposed structure in (19) and (20) are right, we predict that the matrix subject (via *PRO* controlled by the subject) can be the antecedent of *zibunzisin* in the complement clause in the Direct and the Possessive TM constructions, but not in the Indirect TM. This prediction is borne out. Consider:

- (24) a. Hanako_i-ga sensei-ni/-kara zibunzisin_i-no
 Hanako-NOM teacher-DAT-/from self-of
 ie-de home-te moraw-ta
 house-LOC praise-TE receive-PAST
 'Hanako had herself praised by her teacher in self's house'
 b. kodomo_j-ga hahaoya-ni/-kara zibunzisin_i-no
 child-NOM mother-DAT-/from SELF-of

beruto-de onbusi-te moraw-ta
 belt-with 'carry on the back'-TE receive-PAST
 'The child had himself carried by his mother on her
 back with self's belt'

The structure of (24a), for example, is given as follows:

(25) [IP Hanako_i-ga [VP [CP [IP PRO_i [VP [pp sensei-ni/-kara] [vp
 [pp zibunzisin_i-no ie-de] [vp t_i home-]]] te]] moraw-ta]]

In (25), the NP *Hanako-ga* is not within the governing category of *zibunzisin*. However, *zibunzisin* can take *PRO* as its antecedent, which in turn is controlled by the matrix subject. Now consider the following Possessive TM sentences.

- (26) a. Hanako_i-ga sensei-ni/-kara zibunzisin_i-no
 Hanako-NOM teacher-DAT/-from self-of
 ie-de kodomo-o home-te moraw-ta
 house-LOC child-ACC praise-TE receive-PAST
 'Hanako had her child praised by the teacher in
 self's house'
- b. Kazue_i-ga Taroo-ni/-kara zibunzisin_i-no heya-de
 Kazue-NOM Taro-DAT/-from self-of room-LOC
 me-o home-te moraw-ta
 eye-ACC praise-TE receive-PAST
 'Kazue had her eyes appreciated by Taro in self's
 room'

Again the matrix subject can serve as the antecedent, since the reflexive is bound in its governing category by *PRO* in the subject position of the embedded clause, which in turn is controlled by the matrix subject.

(27) [IP Hanako_i-ga [VP [CP [IP PRO_i [pp sensei-ni/-kara] [vp t_i
 zibunzisin_i-no ie-de kodomo-o home-] te]] moraw-] ta]

In the case of Indirect TM sentences, on the other hand, it is the 'causee' dative NP that must be coindexed with the reflexive. Consider:

- (28) a. Hanako_i-ga Taro_j-ni zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no heya-kara
 Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT self-of room-from
 deteik-te moraw-ta
 'go out'-TE receive-PAST
 'Hanako had Taro go out of self's room'
- b. Mariko_i-ga kodomo_j-ni zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no heya-de
 Mariko-NOM child-DAT self-of room-LOC
 issyookenmei benkyoosi-te moraw-ta
 hard study-TE
 'Mariko had her child study in self's room'

- (29) [IP Hanako_i-ga [VP Taro_j-ni [CP [IP PRO_j
 [VP zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no heya-kara deteik-] te]] moraw-] ta]

As we see from (29), the reflexive is locally bound by *PRO* that is in turn controlled by the dative NP *Taro_j-ni*. The matrix subject lies outside the governing category of *zibunzisin* so that it cannot bind the reflexive.

Notice that if we force a causative reading in the Direct and the Possessive TM sentences in (24) and (26) by adding the adverb *muriyari* ('forcibly'), the reflexive must be bound by the dative NP. Consider:

- (30) a. Hanako_i-ga muriyari sensei_j-ni zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no ie-de
 home-te moraw-ta
- b. kodomo_i-ga muriyari hahaoya_j-ni zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no
 beruto-de onbusi-te moraw-ta¹²

In (30a), the reflexive must be bound to *sensei-ni* via *PRO*, the sentence yielding pragmatic oddness since few people, if any, would ask anyone to praise his/her own grades. In (30b), it is the mother's belt but not the child's belt that the mother used to carry the child on her back. Just the same is true of the Possessive TM sentences.

- (31) a. Hanako_i-ga muriyari sensei_j-ni zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no ie-de
 kodomo-o home-te moraw-ta
 b. Kazue_j-ga muriyari Taroo_j-ni zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no heya-de
 me-o home-te moraw-ta

We can capture these facts if we analyze the causative meaning of TM sentences as deriving from the object-control construction as in (32):¹³

- (32) a. (the structure of (30a))
 [IP Hanako_i-ga [vp muriyari sensei_j-ni [CP [IP PRO_j
 [vp zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no ie-de *pro* home-] te]] moraw-] ta]
 b. (the structure of (31a))
 [IP Hanako_i-ga [vp muriyari sensei_j-ni [CP [IP PRO_j
 [vp zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no heya-de kodomo-o home-] te]]
 moraw-] ta]

Recall that *zibun* can take NP-*ni* as its antecedent only in Indirect TM sentences. Consider again:

- (7) b. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_{i/*j}-no heya-de home-te
 moraw-ta (Direct TM)
 (8) b. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_{i/*j}-no heya-de kodomo-o
 home-te moraw-ta (Possessive TM)
 (9) b. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_{i/j}-no heya-kara deteik-te
 moraw-ta (Indirect TM)

Terada ascribes this difference to the syntactic difference of *Taroo-ni* in (7b) and (8b) on one hand and (9b) on the other. *Taroo-ni* in (7b) and (8b) is in fact an adjunct PP, so the NP *Taroo* does not c-command *zibun*, while *zibun* in (9b) can be bound by *PRO* that is controlled by the NP *Taroo-ni*.

Interestingly, if we force a causative meaning in (7b) and (8b), the reflexive can take *Taroo-ni* as its antecedent. Consider:

(7') b. Hanako_i-ga muriyari Taroo_j-ni zibun_{i/j}-no heya-de home-te moraw-ta

(8') b. Hanako_i-ga muriyari Taroo_j-ni zibun_{i/j}-no heya-de kodomo-o home-te moraw-ta

We can capture this fact since we analyze (7'b) and (8'b) as having an object-control construction on a par with the Indirect TM sentence (9b).

3.2.2 Blocking Passivization

We have seen so far that the passive meaning of TM sentences is derived when a TM sentence involves "passivization" in the complement clause. An interesting prediction is that if "passivization" is somehow blocked in the complement clause, the TM sentence has to have an object-control structure and can no longer bear a passive meaning.

To see this, let us first see how *te i(ru)* (*te* + aspectual verb *i(ru)* ('be')) blocks passivization. *Te i(ru)* is attached to the end of a verb to make the sentence have a progressive, stative, or perfective meaning (cf. Takezawa (1992)):

- (33) a. Taroo-ga Ziroo-o hihansi-te i-ta
 Taroo-NOM Jiro-ACC criticize-TE be-PAST
 'Taro was criticizing Jiro'
- b. Mariko-ga Hitomi-o home-te i-ta
 Mariko-NOM Hitomi-ACC praise-TE be-PAST
 'Mariko was praising Hitomi'

If *te i(ru)* intervenes between the verb and the passive auxiliary *rare* in a passive sentence, it will block *rare*'s absorption of ACC so that NP-movement of the surface subject will fail to occur. Instead, the resulting

sentence must be an Indirect Passive sentence, which does not involve NP-movement.¹⁴ Compare (34) and (35):

- (34) a. Ziroo-ga Taroo-ni hihans-are-ta
 Jiro-NOM Taro-DAT criticize-PASS-PAST
 'Jiro was criticized by Taro'
 b. Hitomi-ga Mariko-ni home-rare-ta
 Hitomi-NOM Mariko-DAT praise-PASS-PAST
 'Hitomi was praised by Mariko'
- (35) a. Ziroo-ga Taroo-ni hihansi-te i-rare-ta
 criticize-TE be-PASS-PAST
 'Jiro was affected by Taro's criticizing (someone)'
 b. Hitomi-ga Mariko-ni home-te i-rare-ta
 praise-TE be-PASS-PAST
 'Hitomi was affected by Mariko's praising (someone)'

We can see that the sentences in (35) are cases of Indirect Passive since the subject NP must be interpreted as being affected by an event denoted by *NP-ni VP* part. Second, the implicit object of the embedded verb can refer to someone other than the person denoted by the matrix subject. Moreover, *NP-ni* can alternate neither with *NP-kara* nor *NP-niyotte*:

- (36) a. *Ziroo-ga Taroo-kara/-niyotte hihansi-te i-rare-ta
 b. *Hitomi-ga Mariko-kara/-niyotte home-te i-rare-ta

If *te i(ru)* does not intervene between the verb and *rare*, as in (37), the resulting sentence will be a direct passive.

- (37) a. Ziroo-ga Taroo-ni hihans-are-te i-ta
 criticize-PASS-TE be-PAST
 'Jiro was being criticized by Taro'
 b. Hitomi-ga Mariko-ni home-rare-te i-ta
 praise-PASS-TE be-PAST

'Hitomi was being praised by Mariko'

Now let us see how the blocking of passivization by *te i(ru)* interacts with TM sentences. Consider:

- (38) a. Taroo-ga Hanako-ni home-te i-te moraw-ta
 Taro-NOM Hanako-DAT praise-TE be-TE receive-PAST
 'Taro had Hanako praising (someone)'
 b. Hanako-ga sensei-ni kodomo-o home-te i-te
 Hanako-NOM teacher-DAT child-ACC praise-TE be-TE
 moraw-ta
 receive-PAST
 'Hanako had the teacher praising (someone's) child'¹⁵

We assume that as in passive sentences, intervention of *te i(ru)* between the embedded verb and *te* blocks passivization in the complement clause.¹⁶ Then the sentences in (38) must have an object-control structure on a par with the Indirect TM construction so that they must have a causative meaning. Let us see that this is the case.

First, *zibun* in the complement clause can take NP-*ni* as its antecedent, which is impossible in Direct and Possessive TM sentences. Compare (39) with (40):

- (39) a. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_{i/*j}-no heya-de home-te
 moraw-ta (Direct TM) (=7b)
 b. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_{i/*j}-no heya-de kodomo-o
 home-te moraw-ta (Possessive TM) (=8b)
 (40) a. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_{i/j}-no heya-de home-te i-te
 moraw-ta
 b. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibun_{i/j}-no heya-de kodomo-o
 home-te i-te moraw-ta

Second, the reflexive *zibunzisin* cannot refer back to the matrix subject:

- (41) a. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no heya-de home-te i-te moraw-ta
 b. Hanako_i-ga Taroo_j-ni zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no heya-de kodomo-o home-te i-te moraw-ta

Third, NP-*ni* cannot alternate with NP-*kara*:

- (42) a. *Taroo-ga Hanako-kara home-te i-te moraw-ta
 b. *Hanako-ga sensei-kara kodomo-o home-te i-te moraw-ta

Fourth, the adverb *omoigakezu* cannot occur since the matrix subject must be taken as an agent-causer:

- (43) a. *Taroo-ga omoigakezu Hanako-ni home-te i-te moraw-ta
 b. *Hanako-ga omoigakezu sensei-ni kodomo-o home-te i-te moraw-ta

These facts all suggest that Direct and Possessive TM sentences are derived via passivization within the complement clause.

3.2.3 On the Position of NP-*ni-kara*

Several linguists have made different proposals on where NP-*ni-kara* lies in TM sentences. Arisaka *et al.* (1992) regard TM sentences uniformly as an object-control construction, analyzing NP-*ni* as the dative object of the matrix verb *moraw*,¹⁷ while Shibatani (1978) concludes that NP-*ni-kara* is in fact the dative subject of the complement clause. In Section 3.1 we assigned, following Terada (1990) and Zushi (1992), different syntactic positions to NP-*ni-kara* in Direct and Possessive TM sentences on one hand and Indirect TM sentences on the other. These three different approaches can be shown as follows:

- (44) a. "Matrix dative object" analysis of NP-*ni*

- [IP NP-ga [VP NP_i-ni [CP PRO_i te] moraw]]
- b. "Embedded dative subject" analysis of NP-*ni/-kara*
 [IP NP-ga [S (=IP) NP-*ni/-kara* [VP] te] moraw]]
- c. "Two types" analysis
 Direct and Possessive:
 [IP NP_i-ga [CP PRO_i [VP NP-*ni/-kara* [VP te]] moraw]]
 Indirect:
 [IP NP-ga [VP NP_i-ni [CP PRO_i te] moraw]]

One piece of evidence suggests that (44c) is the most plausible analysis.¹⁸ Consider the following examples:

- (45) a. Direct TM:
 Hanako-ga omoigakezu *subete-no sensei-ni/-kara home-te-sae* moraw-ta
- b. Possessive TM:
 Hanako-ga omoigakezu *subete-no sensei-ni/-kara kodomo-o home-te-sae* moraw-ta
- c. Indirect TM:
 Hanako-ga *subete-no gakusei-ni heya-kara deteik-te-sae* moraw-ta

In each example, a focus particle *sae* ('even') is attached to the complement clause of the verb *moraw*. The point to examine is whether we can take the quantified NP-*ni/-kara* as in the scope of *sae* in the construal. The most natural interpretation for (45a) and (45b) is to take *subete-no sensei-ni/-kara* as taking scope narrower than *sae*: it even happened to Hanako that she was praised by all the teachers. (She had expected to be praised by some teachers at most, not by every teacher.) On the other hand, the quantified NP-*ni* in (45c) must be interpreted as taking wide scope over the complement clause focused by *sae*: for every student *x*, Hanako asked *x* even to go out of the room. (She asked every student to do several things, but it was true of every student that it was unexpected that she asked him/her to go out of the room.)

These interpretive facts are expected in our analysis of TM constructions. NP-*ni-kara* of Direct and Possessive TM sentences is an adjunct PP inside the complement clause, while NP-*ni* in the Indirect TM is a matrix argument θ -marked by *moraw*. This structural difference is represented as follows:

- (46) a. Direct and Possessive:
 [IP NP_i-ga [CP PRO_i [VP NP-*ni/-kara* VP-*te*]]-*sae moraw*]]
 b. Indirect:
 [IP NP-ga [VP NP_i-*ni* [CP PRO_i VP *te*]-*sae moraw*]]

We have been arguing that the Direct and Possessive TM's have an object-control structure on a par with the Indirect TM when they have a causative meaning. The above quantifier-scope test confirms our analysis. Consider:

- (47) a. Hanako-ga muriyari *subete-no sensei-ni home-te-sae*
moraw-ta
 b. Hanako-ga muriyari *subete-no sensei-ni/-kara kodomo-o*
home-te-sae moraw-ta

In each example, the universally quantified dative NP (*subete-no sensei-ni*) is naturally understood as taking wide scope over the focused complement clause.

The observations so far strongly suggest the structural difference between the Direct/Possessive TM and the Indirect TM, in particular the syntactic difference between passive TM's and causative TM's.

4. Possessive Passive and Possessive TM

I have remained silent in the preceding sections as to a precise syntactic derivation of Possessive Passive and Possessive TM sentences, except that the surface subject of the former construction and the embedded null subject *PRO* are each derived via NP-movement from a VP-

internal position on a par with Direct Passive and TM sentences. In this section I make just a brief and sketchy proposal on this issue.¹⁹

What we call the Possessive Passive was sometimes considered as a subcase of the Indirect Passive (Kuno (1973), Washio (1990) among others). Kubo (1990) has argued that the Possessive Passive forms a natural class with the Direct Passive, not with the Indirect Passive, with respect to their syntactic properties. As one of such properties, Kubo shows that NP-*ni* ('by NP') alternates with NP-*niyotte* in the Direct and the Possessive Passives, but not in the Indirect Passive, as we saw in Section 1:

(48) a. Direct:

Taroo-wa kanozyo-ni/-niyotte tasuke-rare-ta
 Taro-TOP she-DAT/-by rescue-PASS-PAST
 'Taro was saved by her'

b. Possessive:

Taroo-wa kanozyo-ni/-niyotte inoti-o tasuke-rare-ta
 Taro-TOP she-by life-ACC rescue-PASS-PAST
 'Taro had his life saved by her'

c. Indirect:

Taroo-wa kanozyo-ni/*-niyotte huroosya-o
 Taro-TOP she-DAT/-by bum-ACC
 tasuke-rare-ta
 rescue-PASS-PAST

'Taro had her rescue bums on him' (Kubo (1990))

Kubo and Terada both analyze the surface subject of the Possessive Passive as having its corresponding syntactic gap inside the "possessee" NP:

(49) [IP NP_i [VP [NP₁ [NP₂ *t_i*] N₁] V]]

We can make sure at least that the surface subject of a Possessive Passive sentence is derived via NP-movement from inside VP. Consider:

- (50) a. *gakusei-ga* [vp *kooen-de huroosya-ni go-nin atama-o*
 student-NOM park-LOC bum-DAT 5-CL head-ACC
nagur]-are-ta
 hit-PASS-PAST (Possessor Passive)
 'Five students had their head hit in the park by a bum'
- b. **gakusei-ga* [vp *kooen-de ame-ni go-nin hur*]-are-
 student-NOM park-LOC rain-DAT five-CL fall-PASS-
 ta
 PAST (Indirect Passive)
 'Five students had a rain fall (on them) in the park'

Miyagawa (1989) shows that a floated numeral quantifier and its host NP must c-command each other. If it is correct, (50a) shows there is a trace of *gakusei-ga* VP-internally that c-commands, and is c-commanded by, the floated quantifier *go-nin*.

There are reasons, however, to suggest an alternative analysis to the one summarized schematically in (49). For one thing, there are cases where the possessor position inside the "possessee" NP is lexically filled:²⁰

- (51) a. ?*Hanako-ga sensei-kara zibun-no seiseki-o*
 Hanako-NOM teacher-from SELF-of grade-ACC
 home-rare-ta
 praise-PASS-PAST
 'Hanako had self's grade praised by her teacher'
- b. ?*kodomo-tati-ga minna warui yatu-niyotte*
 child-PL-NOM all bad guy-by
zibun-no omotya-o kowas-are-ta
 self-of toy-ACC break-PASS-PAST
 'The children all had self's toys broken by a bad guy'

Secondly, there are also cases where the alleged syntactic gap would be further embedded within the possessee NP which in turn is the possessor of the outer NP:

- b. Le médecin a examiné la gorge aux enfants
 the doctor examined the throat to-the children
 'The doctor examined the children's throat'
 (Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992))

The reader should be referred to Homma (1993) , where I give detailed discussion on the Possessive Passive and its comparison to the Inalienable Possession construction in French.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have provided some pieces of empirical evidence for syntactically distinguishing two types of TM sentences in Japanese. The syntactic distinction is actually not an "absolute" one, since those TM sentences that are (potentially) ambiguous with respect to the semantic dichotomy "passive sense vs. causative sense" must be assigned two distinct syntactic representations.

NOTES

* An earlier version of this paper was read at a Monthly Colloquium of Tsukuba English Linguistic Society in February, 1992. I would like to thank the audience for comments and discussions. Thanks also go to the anonymous *TES* reviewers whose comments have helped me revise the paper. Any remaining error is my own.

¹ Proposals to the same effect have been made by Terada (1990) and Zushi (1992). The present paper happens to support their analysis empirically.

² See Terada (1990) and Kubo (1990) among others. It would be somewhat controversial, however, to characterize Possessive Passive as forming a natural class with Direct Passive, not with Indirect Passive. Some linguists (Washio (1990) etc.) characterize Possessive Passive as a subtype

of Indirect Passive. Terada and Kubo provide empirical arguments for the former stance.

³ That NP-*ni* can be the antecedent of *zibun* in Direct Passive, but not in Indirect Passive, was pointed out in McCawley (1972) and Kuno (1973).

⁴ I employ the term "agent causer" simply to distinguish it from what may be called "nonagent causer", as exemplified as the subject NP in (ii):

(i) Gorvachev-ga muriyari gaimudaizin-o
 Gorvachev-NOM forcibly 'the Minister of Foreign Affairs'-ACC
 America-e ik-ase-ta
 America-to go-CAUSE-PAST
 'Gorvachev made the Minister of Foreign Affairs go to
 America'

(ii) [Gorvachev-ga sikkyakusi-ta koto]-ga
 Gorvachev-NOM 'lose one's position'-PAST fact -NOM
 gaimudaizin-o America-e ik-ase-ta
 'That Gorvachev lost his position caused the Minister of
 Foreign Affairs to go to America'

(Okuyama (1992))

As I discuss in Section 3, the matrix subject NP receives the θ -role "agent causer", the same role assigned to the matrix subject *Gorvachev* in (i). I do not intend to go into details of causative sentences here. My intention is just to show that the Indirect TM construction has a syntactic structure similar to that of causatives.

⁵ Note that in (14a), the theme object of the verb *home* can be either Hanako or someone else (See Note 8). Note also that in (14b), the possessor of the child (*kodomo*) may be someone other than Hanako, while the subject NP must be the possessor in the case of TM sentences with a passive meaning.

⁶ Terada assumes that the subject NP of Possessive Passive is derived via NP-movement from inside the object NP, assuming N-incorporation (in

the sense of Baker (1988)) of the head of the object NP to the governing verb:

- (i) DS: [IP ___ [VP [VP [NP Hanako [N kodomo]] home] -rare] ta]
 SS: [IP Hanako_i-ga [VP [VP [NP *t*_i [N *t*_j]] [N+v kodomo_j-o home]] -rare] ta]

She assigns the same derivation to the embedded subject *PRO* in the Possessive TM construction. I will consider an alternative derivation for the Possessive Passive and TM in Section 4.

⁷ Terada (1990) assumes that *te* carries out Case-absorption and Agent demotion, on a par with the passive auxiliary *rare*. An anonymous *TES* reviewer points out that it may be the lexical property of the matrix verb governing the *te* clause that determines whether *te* carries out these two tasks. Indeed, only a restricted set of verbs induces GF changing in the complement *te* clause that they govern:

- (i) hon-ga/o oi-te ar-ta
 book-NOM/-ACC place-TE be-PAST
 'A book was placed'
- (ii) a. Taroo-ga hon-o oi-te i-ta
 Taro-NOM book-ACC place-TE be-PAST
 'Taro was placing a book'
- b. *hon-ga oi-te i-ta

A relevant assumption is that the passive-morpheme-like property of the particle *te* is activated by the verb that selects it. *Ar(-u)* is one such kind of verb. The relevant class of verbs must be θ -marking the *te* clause in order for GF changing to occur. Thus GF changing could not take place in an adjunct *te* clause:

- (iii) hon-ga [hyoosi-o/*-ga hirai-te] oi-te ar-u
 book-NOM cover-ACC/-NOM open-TE put-TE be-PRES

'A book is placed with its cover open'

In the present analysis of TM sentences, only the *moraw* taking Benefactive and Event roles (See (18).) can induce GF changing (although it is a covert process) in the complement *te* clause. A question, however, naturally arises as to why it is that only the "two place" *moraw* in (18) can induce Case-absorption and Agent demotion.

This question seems to be related to an issue (pointed out by the *TES* reviewer) of whether one has to posit two *moraw*'s as distinct lexical items. It indeed sounds theoretically elegant to analyze the apparently distinct *moraw*'s uniformly, deriving one of their argument structures from the other's by some lexical rule. But then another question arises as to what the (non)application of the lexical rule in *moraw* has to do with the (non) application of Case-absorption and Agent demotion in its complement clause. This is too complicated an issue to deal with in the present paper and I leave it for future research.

⁸ Arisaka *et al.* (1992) identify the TM construction and the *te-age* construction as an object-control and a subject control construction, respectively. They argue that the dative NP in the TM construction must be a matrix argument NP θ -marked by the verb *moraw*. What was missing in their discussion, however, is those TM sentences with a passive meaning which I show to have a syntactic derivation different from those with a causative meaning. The analysis proposed by Arisaka *et al.* will do only as far as the causative TM is concerned.

⁹ Note that the predicate in the complement clause of a TM sentence must denote an event, whether an action or a state. Thus only stage-level predicates, in the sense of Carlson (1977), among others, may take place as the embedded predicate of a TM sentence. Thus the following examples with individual-level predicates *sir-te i(ru)* ('know') and *kiraw-te i(ru)* ('hate') are ungrammatical:

- (i) a. *Hanako-ga Taroo-ni [*PRO* eigo-no bunpoo-o
English-of grammar-ACC

sir-te i-te] moraw-ta

know-TE be-TE

'*Hanako had Taro know English grammar'

- b. *Hanako-ga Taroo-ni [*PRO* seizika-o kiraw-te i-te]
 politician-ACC hate-TE

moraw-ta

'*Hanako had Taro hate politicians'

The same 'semantic' restriction holds of the causative *have* construction in English (Ritter and Rosen (1990)), which appears to have a significant similarity to the TM construction:

(iii) Stage-level predicates:

- a. John had Bill run in the three-legged race.
- b. Brian had Mila write the French exam.
- c. Barbara had George take a shower. (Ritter and Rosen (1990))

(iv) Individual-level predicates:

- a. *John had Bill like French cooking.
- b. *John had Bill want to learn cooking.
- c. *John had Bill know French. (ibid.)

In this regard, Kubo (1992) observes that some stative verbs cannot occur in the complement clause of TM sentences:

- (v) *Hanako-wa (Taroo-ni) tyuumoku-ni ataisi-te moraw-ta
 Hanako-TOP Taro-DAT attention-DAT 'be worth'-TE
 'Hanako had Taro worth paying attention to'

This is not true of those stative verbs with the surface form *V-te i(ru)*, however, as long as they denote a temporal state of the subject:

- (vi) a. Taroo-ga koibito-ni [*PRO* osiire-ni hair-te i-te]
 girlfriend-DAT closet-DAT 'be in'-TE be-TE

- moraw-ta
 'Taro had his girlfriend stay in the closet'
 b. kantoku-ga sono yakusya-ni [*PRO* syatu-o
 director-NOM that-actor-DAT shirt-ACC
 nug-de i-te] moraw-ta
 'take off-TE be-TE
 'The director had the actor remain without a shirt on'

Notice that neither of the embedded predicates denotes a process or an action. Rather, they are taken as denoting a state of being in the closet and a state of being without a shirt on.

¹⁰ Arisaka *et al.* (1992) adopts Larson's (1991) Minimal Distance Principle in determining the controller of *PRO*: the NP that minimally c-commands *PRO* at DS is selected as the controller of *PRO*. In this paper, the DS configuration of the passive TM is given as follows:

- (i) [IP NP [VP [CP [IP *e* [[pp NP-ni/-kara] [VP *PRO* home] te]] moraw]]

For *PRO* in the object position of the embedded verb, the minimally c-commanding NP is the matrix subject. Thus we can correctly select the controller of *PRO*. As for how the controller is selected in causative TMs, see Arisaka *et al.* (1992).

¹¹ For the definition of governing category, see Chomsky (1986).

¹² Anonymous *TES* reviewers have pointed out that *zibunzisin* may be bound to the matrix subject in the following examples:

- (i) butyoo_i-ga muriyari Katoo-san_j-ni zibunzisin_{i/j}-no
 'chief director'-NOM forcibly Kato-Mr.-DAT self-of
 eigyooseiseki-nituite hyookasi-te moraw-ta
 'business performance'-for evaluate-TE
 'The chief director forcibly had Mr. Kato evaluate self's
 business performance'

I suspect that the reading that the reviewers point out (*butyoo* = *zibunzisin*) comes from the matrix interpretation of the adjunct that contains the local anaphor (*zibunzisin-no eigyooseiseki-nituite*). The adjunct phrase may be taken as modifying either the embedded verb (*hyookasi-*) or the matrix verb (*moraw-*). When the adjunct modifies the matrix verb, it may correspondingly be adjoined to the matrix VP:

- (ii) [IP *butyoo*_i-ga [VP *muriyari* [NP *katoosanj-ni*]
 [ADJ *zibunzisin*_{i/j}-no] [CP [IP *PRO*_j [VP *pro hyookasi*]-te]
moraw]-ta]

In (30a), *zibunzisin* cannot be bound to the matrix subject *Hanako* if the adjunct containing the local anaphor modifies the embedded verb *home-* ('praise'). The sentence with this modification relation is true if Hanako asked the teacher in his office to praise her in her house. On this interpretation, the long distance binding of *zibunzisin* by *Hanako* is impossible. The long distance binding will be somewhat better if one takes into account the reading where the adjunct modifies the matrix verb *moraw*. The sentence with this reading is true if Hanako asked the teacher in her house to praise her. Just the same seems true of (30b). The long distance binding is impossible under the normal circumstance described by the sentence, although it seems to improve under the less salient reading where the instrumental adjunct modifies the matrix verb: the child asked his mother with his belt to carry him on her back (the child used his belt in order to ask his mother to carry him on her back).

¹³ As I show in (32a), *pro* appears in the object position of the embedded verb in the causative Direct TM construction. As *pro* may choose to be bound or not to be bound by an intrasentential potential antecedent (in the present case, *Hanako-ga*), the person to have been praised may be Hanako or some other person. In the case of TM sentences with the passive meaning, on the other hand, the person having been praised has to be the person denoted by the matrix subject, since the NP-trace in the embedded object position is bound by the moved *PRO*, which in turn gets controlled by

the matrix subject. As for how the possessor of the child is determined in the Possessive TM (32b), see Section 4.

14 See Washio (1990) and Terada (1990), among others, for the derivation of Indirect Passive sentences.

15 As indicated in the English translations, *te i(ru)* in these examples has the progressive sense.

16 We assume, with Miyagawa (1989), that the passive morpheme *rare* absorbs Accusative or Dative Case and induces Agent Demotion only if *rare* governs the verb. An intervention of an element between these elements will lead to violation of some Minimality requirement for government of the verb by *rare*.

17 See also Nakau (1973), who proposes to derive TM sentences by the application of Equi-NP-Deletion wherein the embedded subject, identical with the matrix dative NP, is deleted.

18 Cf. Zushi (1992) for further evidence for the embedded adjunct NP-*ni/-kara*.

19 I leave the detailed discussion on the Possessive Passive to Homma (1993).

20 The marginality of the examples in (51) may be ascribed to a pragmatic factor. It is not necessary to use the overt lexical item *zibun* to express the situation well denoted by the sentence without it (*Hanako-ga sensei-kara ϕ seiseki-o home-rare-ta*). The use of *zibun* may give rise to a violation of the Maxim of Quantity (Grice (1975)) in a normal context.

As a support of this, the acceptability of the sentences in (51) arises if we utter the sentences with a contrastive focal stress on *zibun* in contexts such as the following:

- (i) a. I had thought that Hanako's teacher was going to praise her son's grades, but I have realized that the teacher praised her own grades that she had taken in her school days.

(Contrast: *zibun* (= Hanako) vs. Hanako's son)

- b. I had thought that every child had his bother's toy broken by a bum. But it turned out that each of them had his own toy broken. (Contrast: *zibun* (=child) vs. the child's brother)

21 That the alleged gap, if there were one, should be inside the possessor NP (NP2) is also confirmed by the following N'-deletion (Saito and Murasugi (1989)) test.

- (i) Hanako-no musuko-no sakuhin-wa yokatta ga,
 Hanako-of son-of artwork-TOP good-PAST though
 'Although Hanako's son's artwork was good, '
 <1> Mariko-no musuko-no ϕ -wa yokunakatta
 Mariko-of son-of ϕ -TOP 'not good'-PAST
 <2> *Mariko-no ϕ -wa yokunakatta
 (OK if 'Mariko's artwork was not good')

As Saito and Murasugi discuss, only a constituent (N') in an NP can be deleted. Sentence <2> could not mean "Mariko's son's artwork was not good," since the deleted subpart in (ii) does not form a constituent:

- (ii) [NP [NP Mariko-no [N' kodomo]]-no [N' sakuhin]]-wa ...

REFERENCES

- Arisaka, K., S. Homma, H. Hoshi, M. Matsuoka, and K. Takeda (1992)
 "Control and *Te*-clauses in Japanese," *Tsukuba English Studies* 11.
 231-278.
- Baker, M. (1988) *Incorporation*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.
- Carlson, G. (1977) *Reference to Kinds in English*. Ph.D. diss. UMass.
- Chomsky, N. (1986) *Barriers*. MIT Press. MA.
- Grice, P. (1975) "Logic and Conversation," in P. Cole ed. *Syntax and Semantics 9: Pragmatics*. 113-128. Academic Press. New York.
- Homma, S. (1993) "Syntax of Possessor Passive in Japanese," ms.
 Niigata University.
- Katada, F. (1991) "The LF Representation of Anaphors," *Linguistic Inquiry* 22. 287-313.

- Kubo, M. (1990) "Japanese Passives," ms. MIT.
- _____ (1992) *Japanese Syntactic Structures and Their Configurational Meanings*. Ph.D. diss. MIT.
- Kuno, S. (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. MIT Press. MA.
- Larson, R. (1991) "Promise and the Theory of Control," *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 103-139.
- McCawley, N. A. (1972) "On the Treatment of Japanese Passives," in P. M. Peranteau, J. n. Levi, and G. C. Phares eds., *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, University of Chicago, Chicago, 256-270.
- Miyagawa, S. (1989) *Syntax and Semantics 22: Structure and Case Marking in Japanese*. Academic Press. New York.
- Nakau, M. (1973) *Sentential Complementation in Japanese*. Kaitakusha. Tokyo.
- Okuyama, M. (1992) "Make-Causatives and Have-Causatives in English," *Tsukuba English Studies* 11, 171-197. University of Tsukuba.
- Ritter, E. and S.-T. Rosen (1990) "Causative Have," ms. Université de Québec à Montréal and University of Maryland.
- Saito, M. and K. Murasugi (1989) "N'-deletion in Japanese," ms. University of Connecticut.
- Shibatani, M. (1978) *Nihongo no Bunseki*. Taishuukan. Tokyo.
- Sugimoto, T. (1985) "Similarities Between Passives and *Te-moraw* Constructions in Japanese," *Metropolitan Linguistics* 5. 67-93.
- Takezawa, K. (1992) "Zyudoobun, Nookakubun, Bunrihukanoosyoyuukoobun to "Te Iru" no Kaisyaku," in Y. Nitta ed. *Nihongo no Voice to Tadoosei*. Kuroshio Publishers. Tokyo.
- Terada, M. (1990) *Incorporation and Argument Structure in Japanese*. Ph.D. diss. UMass.
- Vergnaud, J. R. and M. L. Zubizarreta (1993) "The Definite Determiner and the Inalienable Constructions in French and in English," *Linguistic Inquiry* 23. 595-652.
- Washio, R. (1990) "The Japanese Passive," *The Linguistic Review* 6. 227-263.
- Zushi, M. (1992) "The Syntax of Dative Constructions in Japanese," ms.

McGill University.

**Faculty of Education
Niigata University**