# A construal-based analysis of direct and indirect passives in Japanese

## Kazumi SUGAI*

　本稿の目的は、現代日本語の受身文(passive)に対し、直接受身文と間接受身文を統一的に把握するとともに、間接受身文において「被害性(adversity)」を生じさせる動機づけを明示的に説明することにある。伝統的に日本語の受身文は直接受身文と間接受身文とに区別され、後者は、①対応する能動文がないこと、②被害の意味が含まれることの２点において直接受身文とは画然と異なるとの分析が与えられて来た。本稿では、受動文の生成原理を「図地反転(figure/ground reversal)」に求め、受動化に際して格上げされる斜格に多様性を認めた上で、直接受身文を作るとされる「ヲ格」のほか「ニ格」「カラ格」「ノ格」および「複合辞(complex case)」までを含めることで、間接受身文にも、対応する能動文が存在し得る可能性を拓き、例外が見つからないことから、間接受身文にも常に対応する能動文が存在するとの帰結を導く。次いで、間接受身文が何故「被害」の意味を含むかについて、間接受身文にも能動文が仮定されることを前提に、間接受身文の主語が、能動文において本来的には事象に関与しないものであって、それが能動文において斜格として事象に組み込まれた段階で被害の意味が萌芽的に生じることを確認し、被害の意味は、その斜格成分が周辺的な地位から受動化によって中心的な地位(主格)に格上げされることで、萌芽的に生じていた被害性が増幅されるものと分析した。このことは、能動文の段階で何ら被害性を示さなければ受動化しても被害性を含意しないことから具体的に確認されたので、本稿での議論により、間接受身文に能動文を前提とすることで、間接受身文における被害の含意は、経験基盤主義の見地から意味的に説明されたことになる。

キーワード：受動文　　複合辞　　図地反転　　被害性　　解釈
Key words：passive, complex case marker, Figure/Ground reversal, adversity, construal

## 1. DIRECT VS. INDIRECT PASSIVES

　The purpose of the present paper is to give a unificational explanation to both the direct passive and the indirect passive in Japanese, and thereon to clarify what motivates adversity in the indirect passive. In previous literature, as opposed to our destination, Japanese passives have been divided into two types, the direct passive and the indirect passive, as for example Teramura(1982:214-217) states. The direct passive depicts the subject NP directly affected in the event as in (1a), while the indirect passive depicts the subject NP with its concomitant or part actually affected, as in (1b). [1]

（1）a. *Taro-ga　　Jiro-ni　　koros-are-ta.*
　　　　Taro-NOM　Jiro-DAT　kill-PASS-PERF
　　　　"Taro was killed by Jiro."

　　b. *Hanako-ga　　saifu-wo　　nusum-are-ta.*
　　　　Hanako-NOM　wallet-ACC　steal-PASS-PERF
　　　　"Hanako had her wallet stolen."

The sentence in (1a) is referred to as the direct passive in that the subject *Taro* is directly affected in the process of *Jiro*'s killing him, whereas the sentence in (1b) is classified as the indirect passive because the subject *Hanako* herself is only indirectly affected in the event of her *saifu* "wallet" being stolen.[2]

　There is a twofold distinction between the direct passive and the indirect passive. Firstly, as is maintained by Howard and Niyekawa-Howard(1976:203), Kuno(1973:22-24), Shibatani(1978:135), Siewierska(1984:154-155) and Takami(1995:82-83), unlike the direct passive, it is said that there is no corresponding active sentence to any indirect passive, as is illustrated in(2).

---

＊Department of Language Studies, Hyogo University of Teacher Education

( 2 ) a. *Taro-ga     haha-ni      shin-are-ta.*
        Taro-NOM   mother-DAT   die-PASS-PERF
        "Taro had his mother die."


   b. *\*Haha-ga      Taro-wo  / Taro-ni     shin-da.*
        mother-NOM  Taro-ACC / Taro-DAT  die-PERF
      " * The mother died Taro / to Taro."


The indirect passives are analyzed as lacking their corresponding actives in that the active in (2b), which theoretically corresponds to (2a), is ungrammatical, whether *Taro* is marked with the accusative or the dative. In other words, the indirect passives have no corresponding actives virtually because the nominative NP (or its topicalized NP) in the indirect passive is not derivative from the active but is just added, as is described in Kuno(1973:24), Howard and Niyekawa-Howard(1976:202-203), Shiewierska(1984:154-155) and Palmer (1994:131).

The other distinction is made on the observation that the indirect passive usually implies some adversity, as is often stated in Mikami(1972:103) as well as Kuno(1973:24), Wierzbicka(1988:Ch.4) and Shibatani(1990:320). For example, the indirect passive sentences in (4) indicate adverse effects, regardless of the lexical meaning of the predicative verb.


( 3 ) a. *Taro-ga     Hanako-ni    piano-wo     hik-are-ta.*
        Taro-NOM   Hanako-DAT   piano-ACC   play-PASS-PERF
        "(lit.) Taro had the piano played by Hanako."


   b. *Jiro-ga      shashin-wo    tor-are-ta.*
        Jiro-NOM   picture-ACC   take-PASS-PERF
        "Jiro got his picture taken (against his will)."


Most native Japanese speakers would read the indirect passive sentence in (3a) as implying such adversity that *Taro* feels uncomfortable to hear *Hanako* playing the piano, whether she plays well or badly. Likewise in (3b) native speakers are most likely to read the nominative subject *Jiro* as having some adverse or frustrated feeling about having his picture taken.[3]

In the above-mentioned respects it is true that the indirect passive is distinct from the direct passive. From a theoretical point of view, however, there are two problems. Firstly, according to the markedness theory it is extremely unnatural that the active sentence (as the unmarked term) is absent when the corresponding passive (as the marked term) is present.[4] As was seen in the example above, the indirect passive lacks its corresponding active virtually because the promoted nominative cannot be returned to any appropriate position in the active. Thus, if the source of the promoted nominative can be identified in the active, and the indirect passive proved to have its corresponding active, then the both types of passives can ultimately be treated in a unified way. The second is that the semantic explanation has to be given to the reason why most indirect passives imply some adversity, whether the adversity is a (part of the) construction meaning or not.

In what follows, the first problem is resolved in Sections 2-4 by unifying the two types of passives in the theoretically natural way, and the second problem will be taken up in the fifth section.[5]


## 2. PROCEDURE FOR FORMATION OF JAPANESE PASSIVES

This section is devoted to presenting a unificational procedure for forming Japanese passives. Its initial focus on the direct passive will prove to have applications also to the indirect passive.

In Cognitive Grammar, passivization is understood as a kind of Figure/Ground reversal, i.e. demoting the most salient participant (trajector) to a less salient position, while instead promoting another participant to the most salient position, with the verb morphologically conjugated in some languages, as is stated in Langacker(1982, 1990:229). It is noticed here, in Japanese, that our discussion about passivization must evolve to the level of morphological (surface) cases such as the

nominative, the accusative and other cases, and not upon grammatical functions or relations such as the subject, the object and so forth. For, in my view, previous literature fails to treat systematically the direct and indirect passives mainly because they analyze the passives at the level of grammatical functions.

This paper presents the set of procedures for passivization as follows:

( 4 ) ( i )  demotion of the nominative to an oblique, or deletion.

( ii )  promotion of an oblique to the nominative.

( iii )  suffixation of the morpheme -are(ru) to the verbal root.

( i ) is the formal realization of what is called "agent-defocusing," "agent-demoting" or "agent-suppression," which is the typologically-valid condition for passives, as is pointed out by Shibatani(1985:830f) and Givón(1990:567), thereby the nominative NP loses the status of FIGURE and is demoted to an oblique (usually the dative in Japanese), which instead is identified as GROUND. (ii) requires the promotion of one of the obliques as GROUND to the nominative as FIGURE. In this respect, the present paper maintains that the category of the obliques sould be so broad as to range from the accusative case to the genitive case and the complex case, as will be mentioned in Sections 3 and 4. Finally, (iii) states that it is necessary to inevitably insert the auxiliary verb -are(ru) into the predicative structure for any passive, with some variations according to its morphosyntactic environment.

Consider the following typical example, where the active in (5a) is changed to the (direct) passive voice in (5b).

( 5 ) a.  *Taro-ga    Hanako-wo    koroshita.*
        Taro-NOM  Hanako-ACC  kill(PERF)
        "Taro killed Hanako."

    b.  *Hanako-ga    Taro-ni    koros-are-ta.*
        Hanako-NOM  Taro-DAT  kill-PASS-PERF
        "Hanako was killed by Taro."

The agentive nominative *Taro* in (5a) is demoted to the dative in (5b), whereas the accusative *Hanako* in (5a) is reinterpreted as the most salient by being promoted to the nominative in (5b), which results in the reversal between the nominative (FIGURE) and the oblique (GROUND).[6]

In Japanese, and likewise in English, the dative element in the active can also be promoted to the nominative through passivization. Consider the following examples, where (6a) can be changed to either the passive in (6b) or (6c).[7]

( 6 ) a.  *Sensei-ga    Taro-wo    Hanako-ni    shoukaishita.*
        teacher-NOM  Taro-ACC  Hanako-DAT  introduce(PERF)
        "The teacher introduced Taro to Hanako."

    b.  *Taro-ga    Hanako-ni    shoukais-are-ta.*
        Taro-NOM  Hanako-DAT  introduce-PASS-PERF
        "Taro was introduced to Hano (by the teacher)."

    c.  *Hanako-ga    Taro-wo    shoukais-are-ta.*
        Hanako-NOM  Taro-ACC  introduce-PASS-PERF
        "Hanako was made to meet Taro (by the teacher)."

In (6b) the promoted nominative *Taro* comes from the accusative in (6a), whereas in (6c) the promoted nominative *Hanako* comes from the dative.[8] What is important to notice is that there is some difference in affectedness between the two promoted nominatives *Taro* in (6b) and *Hanako* in (6c). It is clear that, of these two promoted nominatives, *Taro* is more

directly affected by the agent *sensei* "teacher" than *Hanako* because in the process of introduction the agent directly affects *Taro*, and just indirectly *Hanako* in the secondary object.

Moreover, besides the accusative NP and the dative NP, the ablative *(-kara)* NP can be promoted to the nominative through passivization. For example, the active sentence in (7a) can be changed to the direct passive in (7b) as well as to the indirect passive in (7c).

( 7 ) a.   *Taro-ga    Jiro-kara  saifu-wo    nusum-da.*
            Taro-NOM  Jiro-ABL  wallet-ACC  steal-PERF
            "Taro stole the wallet from Jiro."

     b.   *Saifu-ga    Jiro-kara  Taro-ni    nusum-are-ta.*
            wallet-NOM  Jiro-ABL  Taro-DAT  steal-PASS-PERF
            "The wallet was stolen from Jiro by Taro."

     c.   *Jiro-ga    Taro-ni    saifu-wo    nusum-are-ta.*
            Jiro-NOM  Taro-DAT  saifu-ACC  steal-PASS-PERF
            "Jiro had the wallet stolen by Taro."

The reason is so clear that *saifu* "wallet" is physically moved from *Jiro* to *Taro*, while *Jiro*'s body may not be even touched at all. The promoted nominative *saifu* "wallet" in (7b) comes from the accusative in (7a), whereas the promoted nominative *Jiro* in (7c) comes from the ablative in (7a). It is important that the indirect passive sentence in (7c) is derived basically in the same way as in (7b). It is equally important to notice that, of the two promoted nominatives, the *saifu* "wallet" in (7b) is more directly affected than *Jiro* in (7c) because *saifu* "wallet" is physically moved from *Jiro* to *Taro*, while *Jiro*'s body may not be even touched at all.[9]

Thus the discussion in this section leads to the hypothesis in (8) as follows.

( 8 )  [Passivization Hypothesis] The passives are supposed to have their corresponding actives, in the way that the subject in the passives is located at either the accusative, the dative, or the ablative case in the corresponding actives.

This hypohesis does not only mean that the indirect passives could have their corresponding actives, but also that the direct passives and the indirect passives could be treated basically on the same procedure.

## 3. EXPLANATION OF INDIRECT PASSIVES

This section is devoted to showing that other indirect passives can also be treated by slightly modifying the way proposed in the previous section.

Consider the following examples, where the indirect passive in (9a) is often believed to lack any corresponding actives.

( 7 ) a.   *Taro-ga    nikki-wo    haha-ni    yom-are-ta.*
            Taro-NOM  diary-ACC  mother-DAT  read-PASS-PERP
            "Taro had his diary read by his mother."

     b.   ?? *Haha-ga    Taro-ni  / Taro-kara    nikki-wo  yom-da.*
               mother-NOM  Taro-DAT / Taro-ABL  diary-ACC  read-PERP
            "?? The mother read the diary to Taro / from Taro."

In fact, the corresponding active sentence in (9b) is semantically inadequate, whether the promoted nominative *Taro* is marked with the dative *-ni* case or the ablative *-kara* case. Extending the hypothesis (8), however, the corresponding active

sentence can be grammatically postulated if *Taro* is marked with the genitive *-no* case, as in (9c) below.

( 9 ) c.  *Haha-ga      Taro-no-nikki-wo    yom-da.*
          mother-NOM  Taro-GEN-diary-ACC  read-PERP
          "The mother read Taro's diary."

To the extent that this active expression is naturally acceptable, it is likely that most indirect passives generally have their corresponding actives, where the promoted nominative is marked with the genitive.[10]
  In this vein, it is possible to derive the indirect passive in (10a) from the active in (10b).

(10) a.  *Taro-ga      haha-ni      shin-are-ta.*
          Taro-NOM  mother-DAT  die-PASS-PERF
          "Taro had his mother die."

     b.  *Taro-no-haha-ga          shin-da.*
          Taro-GEN-mother-NOM   die-PERF
          "Taro's mother died."

In (10b), *Taro* is marked with the genitive *-no* to form the compound NP structure *Taro-no-haha* "Taro's mother." It may be controversial, however, when the possessed noun *haha* "mother" is replaced by a proper noun. For example, the passive in (11a) is supposed to have the corresponding active in (11b), which seems problematic within the nominative noun phrase.

(10) a.  *Taro-ga      Hanako-ni    shin-are-ta.*
          Taro-NOM  Hanako-DAT  die-PASS-PERF
          "Taro had Hanako die."

     b.  *Taro-no-Hanako-ga        shin-da.*
          Taro-GEN-Hanako-NOM  die-PERF
          "Taro's Hanako died."

It is true that in (11b) the nominative noun phrase *Taro-no-Hanako* "Taro's Hanako" may seem a little odd. But the acceptability of this noun phrase should be ascribed to the "personal relationship" between the two elements, *Taro* and *Hanako*, as Shibatani(1994:467) points out. If the two persons are not so friendly or intimate, then the noun phrase *Taro-no-Hanako* "Taro's Hanako" in (11b) would seem odd. If they were not friendly enough, however, the passive sentence would never be uttered. As long as the passive like (11a) is uttered, the two persons have to be considered as friendly or intimate enough, and the active in (11b) is also acceptable.
  The hypothesis in (8) is extended to (12) as follows.

(12) 〔Passivization Hypothesis (revised version)〕 The passives are supposed to have their corresponding actives, in the way that the subject in the passives is located at either the accusative, the dative, the ablative, or the genitive case in the corresponding actives.

As far as (12) is valid, most passives proves to have their corresponding actives, whether direct or indirect. But there remain a certain peripheral indirect passives that cannot be supposed to have their corresponding actives, which will be treated in the next section.

## 4. FURTHER PERIPHERAL INDIRECT PASSIVES

  This section is devoted to further peripheral indirect passives, which cannot be treated in the same way as in the previous

sections.

Of the indirect passives, the most difficult ones to explain are perhaps the following kinds of sentences, as has often been mentioned.

(13) a. *Taro-ga    ame-ni    fur-are-ta.*
　　　 Taro-NOM  rain-DAT  fall-PASS-PERF
　　　 "Taro was rained upon."

　 b. *Taro-ga    akachan-ni  nak-are-ta.*
　　　 Taro-NOM  baby-DAT  cry-PASS-PERF
　　　 "Taro was cried at by the baby."

It is so difficult to find corresponding actives to these passives that in fact the following sentences in (14a) and (14b), which theoretically correspond to (13a) and (13b) respectively, are unacceptable or even ungrammatical.

(14) a. ??*Ame-ga    Taro-ni    futta.*
　　　　 rain-NOM  Taro-DAT  fall(PERF)
　　　　 "(lit.) It rained to Taro."

　 b. **Akachan-ga* Taro-ni    naita.*
　　　 baby-NOM  Taro-DAT  cry(PERF)
　　　 "(lit.) The baby cried to Taro."

These active sentences are quite unacceptable virtually because *Taro* cannot be exposed in any appropriate oblique, even if *Taro* is marked with any other case postposition. From the standpoint of the PROTOTYPE THEORY, however, even the indirect passives must not be analyzed as being distinct from the direct passives, although the two types of passives are not homogeneous. It should rather be thought that the more prototypical passive corresponds to the more prototypical active, while the less prototypical passive corresponds to the less prototypical active. This prototypical view allows us to return the promoted nominative to the active sentence in an unprototypical way, i.e. by marking it with a complex case marking. Consider the following active sentences, where (15a) corresponds to (14a), and (15b) to (14b), with special attention to the complex case marking of *Taro*.

(15) a. *Ame-ga    Taro-no-tokoro-ni    futta.*
　　　 rain-NOM  Taro-GEN-place-DAT  fall(PERF)
　　　 "(lit.) It rained in Taro's place."

　 b. *Akachan-ga  Taro-no-sei-de    naita.*
　　　 baby-NOM  Taro-GEN-reason-INSTR  cry(PERF)
　　　 "The baby cried due to Taro."

Though these active sentences are quite acceptable as well as grammatical, they are less prototypical in that *Taro* is marked with the complex structure including such formal nouns as *tokoro* "place" and *sei* "reason" as in (15a) and (15b), respectively. Now one may be opposed to such active sentences as in (15) because the expletive nouns are deleted through passivization. To such an opposition, however, considering that the complex case markings of an NP symbolize its peripheral status, we have to say that these expletive nouns are essential in the active sentence in order to involve *Taro* as a peripheral component, while they are unnecessary in the passive because *Taro* is no longer on the periphery, but in the central position.

The following are some interesting examples of this type. The indirect passive in (16a) may be derived either from (16b)

in which the promoted nominative *Taro* is marked with the genitive, or from (16c) in which *Taro* is marked with the complex case marker.

(16) a.    *Taro-ga*      *Hanako-ni*      *piano-wo*      *hik-are-ta.*
         Taro-NOM    Hanako-DAT   piano-ACC   play-PASS-PERF
         "Taro had the piano played by Hanako."

    b.    *Hanako-ga*      *Taro-no-piano-wo*      *hiita.*
         Hanako-NOM    Taro-GEN-piano-ACC   play(PERF)
         "Hanako played Taro's piano."

    c.    *Hanako-ga*      *Taro-no-soba-de*      *piano-wo*    *hiita.*
         Hanako-NOM   Taro-GEN-side-INSTR   piano-ACC   play(PERF)
         "Hanako played the piano near Taro."

The adverse interpretation in (16a) is doubly ambiguous according to which active sentence could correspond to (16a). That is, if the indirect passive in (16a) is derived from (16b), *Taro* has an adverse feeling perhaps because *Hanako* used *Taro*'s piano without his permission, whereas if (16a) is derived from (16c), *Taro* is interpreted as annoyed by the sound that is produced by *Hanako* on the piano.[11]

It should be noticed here that the use of this kind of complex case markers, including an expletive noun, are not ad hoc in Japanese at all, but they are so usual that they are typically evoked in some common expressions. For example, in translating such an English sentence as "Taro goes to Hanako." into Japanese, the noun phrase *Hanako* cannot be marked with any simple case postposition as in (17a), but requires the complex case marker as in (17b).

(17) a.    *\*Taro-ga*      *Hanako-ni*      *iku.*
         Taro-NOM    Hanako-DAT   go.
         "(lit.) Taro goes to Hanako."

    b.    *Taro-ga*      *Hanako-no-tokoro-ni*      *iku.*
         Taro-NOM    Hanako-GEN-place-DAT   go
         "(lit.) Taro goes to the place of Hanako."

The sentence in (17a) is ungrammatical because the goal *Hanako* is simply marked with the dative *-ni* case, while (17b) is grammatical because *Hanako* is marked with the complex marking structure, including the expletive noun *tokoro* "place." Thus, we can say again that the use of the complex case marking is not ad hoc at all, but they are prevalent in some kinds of common structures, particularly for marking the object of emotion as well as the destination of motion as above, when the referent of the NP is a human being.

From what has been discussed so far, we can conclude that the nominative element in the indirect passive is not an additional one, but is derived either from the oblique (including the genitive) or the complex-marked position. To the extent that this analysis is valid, all passives have their corresponding active sentences, whether direct or indirect.

Now, adding the genitive and the complex case marker to the hypothesis in (12), we have the extended version as follows:

(18) 【Passivization Hypothesis (final version)】 The passives are supposed to have their corresponding actives in the way that the subject in the passives is located at either the accusative, the dative, the ablative, the genitive, or the complex case marker (with a formal noun) in the actives.

Since it is explicated in (18) that the nominative in the indirect passives can be located in the actives in a certain way, and as so far there seems no indirect passive that cannot have its corresponding direct passive by means of (18), we can say that

the Japanese passives can have their corresponding actives, whether direct or indirect.

The sections 2-4 maintain that, contradicting the long-held assumptions, even the most peripheral indirect passives have their counter active sentences basically in the same way as all other passives, and the indirect passives need not be separated from the direct passives, as Nishimura(1992:30) correctly suggests. At the same time there are two points to be noticed here. One is that the passives are never equal in meaning with the corresponding actives, but the passives are definitely different from the active even when the paper maintains that the former is derived from the latter. The reason is that the passives and the actives are structurally different from each other even if the both describe the same situation. The other is that this paper is definitely different in method from the uniform theory, even when it maintains that the direct passives and the indirect passives are treated in the uniform way. The reason is that the cognitive approach does not presuppose any abstract structure at the deep level, as Langacker (1997:26-27) definitely states.

## 5. WHERE DOES ADVERSITY COME FROM ?

This final section is devoted to attempting to explain what virtually motivates some adversity in the indirect passives, on the basis of the assumptions discussed in the previous sections.

As has been often mentioned, the indirect passive sentences, unlike the direct passive, are said to imply some kind of adversity. Then where do all the adversities come from ? Wierzbicka(1988:262) states that the negative implication in the indirect passives is part of the meaning of the syntactic construction. In other words, it is one of the construction meanings according to Goldberg(1995)'s terminology. In some contexts, however, the adversity in the indirect passive can be canceled, as the following examples show.

(19) a.　*Taro-wa　nikki-wo　yom-areru-youni　koini　　　tsukue-no-ue-ni　　oita.*
　　　　　Taro-TOP diary-ACC read-PASS-PURP intentionally desk-GEN-top-DAT put(PERF)
　　　　　"Taro put his diary on the desk intentionally so that it may be read."

　　b.　*Ainshutain-wa sekai-ni　　namae-wo　shir-are-te-iru.*
　　　　　Einstein-TOP　world-DAT　name-ACC　know-PASS-CON-be
　　　　　"Einstein is known by name to the world."

In (19a) *Taro* does not have any adverse feelings at all, but rather he hopes that his diary will be read by someone. Likewise the subject *Ainshutain* "Einstein" in (19b) does not seem to feel uncomfortable at all. These sentences definitely show that the adversity is not any construction meaning, because if it were a (part of the) construction meaning, it could not be canceled. Now the adversity has to be semantically explained in the light of the process of passivization.

As for the adverse implications of the indirect passive, there are two hypothetical explanations proposed. Firstly, Kuno(1983:205) gives a functional analysis in terms of "involvement," i.e. the more indirectly the promoted subject is involved in the event which is predicated by the verb, the more likely the passive sentence is to be interpreted as implying adversity. It is true that his hypothesis is explicit to some extent, but it does not fully explain how the (non-)involvement is actually stipulated or connected with the adversity. Secondly, Shibatani(1990:318-320), following Oehrle and Nishio(1981) analyzes the adversity in terms of "indirectness" as connected with the promoted nominative element that is not directly influenced in the event. This analysis is not fully satisfactory either, however, in that it regards the adversity as intrinsic to the indirect passives.

In order to clear what essentially motivates the adversity in a more specific way, this paper proposes two hypothetical stages of the mechanism as follows:

(20) ( i ) incorporation of the element, which is not intrinsically involved in the event, as a peripheral component into the active sentence.
　　　(ii) promotion of the incorporated element to the central position (i.e. to the nominative) through passivization.

( i ) states that whether or not the indirect passives imply adversity depends upon the interpretation of the corresponding

active sentence, i.e. the adversity is implied in the indirect passives only when it exists in the active sentence. In this case, the adversity sprouts in the active in the way that the peripheral element (which is promoted to the nominative in passivization) is unfavorably or unpleasantly involved in the event. ( ii ) states that when the element is promoted to the central position (i.e. to the nominative) in passivization, the disfavor or displeasure born in ( i ) is amplified.

Now consider the following specific examples, which show that there is some adverse implication even in the active sentences.

(21) a.  [*Taro-no-*]  *haha-ga*  *shin-da.*
         [Taro-GEN-] mother-NOM die-PERF
         "[Taro's] mother died."

     b.  [*Taro-no-tokoro-ni*]  *ame-ga*  *futta.*
         [Taro-GEN-place-DAT] rain-NOM fall(PERF)
         "[In Taro's place] it rained."

     c.  [*Taro-no-soba-de*]  *akachan-ga*  *naita.*
         [Taro-GEN-side-INSTR] baby-NOM cry(PERF)
         "[Near Taro] the baby cried."

These active sentences are perfectly grammatical even when the parenthetic phrases are deleted. In other words, the parenthetic phrases are not intrinsically involved in the event, because the event of the mother's death, rain, or the baby's crying could occur independently of *Taro*. To the extent that *Taro* in each parenthetic phrase is unfavorably or unpleasantly involved in the event, the active sentences as a whole also imply adversity. At the second stage, by promoting *Taro* in the peripheral oblique to the nominative, the sprout adversity is amplified to become so explicit that it cannot be denied, as is shown in (22a), (22b) and (22c), which correspond to the actives in (21a), (21b) and (21c) above, respectively.

(22) a.  *Taro-ga*  *haha-ni*  *shin-are-ta.*
         Taro-NOM mother-DAT die-PASS-PERF
         "Taro had his mother die."

     b.  *Taro-ga*  *ame-ni*  *fur-are-ta.*
         Taro-NOM rain-DAT fall-PASS-PERF
         "Taro was rained upon."

     c.  *Taro-ga*  *akachan-ni*  *nak-are-ta.*
         Taro-NOM baby-DAT cry-PASS-PERF
         "(lit.) Taro was cried at by the baby."

These indirect passives in (22) represent a certain adversity in a more explicit way than in (21). If we did not accept any active sentences corresponding to the indirect passive, the adversity in the active might not only be overlooked, but also we could not explain why the adversity is greater in the passive than in the active.[12]

On the other hand, even the indirect passives do not have any adverse meanings when the promoted element is favorably or pleasantly involved in the event, as the formulation (20) correctly predicts. Consider the following indirect passive sentence in (23a), where the promoted nominative comes from the genitive position in the active as in (23b), not from any other cases.[13]

(23) a.  *Taro-ga*  *densha-ni*  *yur-are-ta.*
         Taro-NOM train-DAT joggle-PASS-PERF

"Taro was joggled in the train."

b. *Taro-no-densha-ga   yureta.*
Taro-GEN-train-NOM  joggle(PERF)
"Taro's train joggled."

The indirect passive in (23a) implies little or no adversity to the extent that in the active sentence in (23b) *Taro* has little or no adversity while his train is joggling.

Finally, our analysis of the adversity in the active sentence is of experiential adequacy, i.e. one is likely to feel uncomfortable to become involved in an event independent of his or her intention when s/he is not intrinsically concerned with the event, and the discomfort is greater when s/he is exposed at the central position of the event. The adversity in the indirect passive is understood in light of this empirical tendency on the linguistic structure. That is, at the stage of (20) ( i ) the peripheral element may well have sprout adversity when it is involved in the event, because it is not an essential component, and at the stage of (20) ( ii ) the adversity is amplified when the element is promoted to the nominative (the most salient position) through passivization.

In addition, the ultimate question may remain unanswered how the active sentence implies some adversity. This question cannot be solved in any unique or objective way, but must be ascribed to the speaker's construal. In fact even the same situation that is described in the active voice can be construed adversely or desirably, from speaker to speaker. As has shown in this paper, the passive is interpreted as adversary if and only if the corresponding active is described as an adversary event, whereas it does not imply adversity if the corresponding active is not described as an adversary event.

## 6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The present paper has attempted to theorize the natural unity between the direct and indirect passives in Japanese. As was illustrated in the text, despite long-held assumptions, all indirect passives do have their corresponding active sentences, if only the promoted nominative is allowed to be marked with the genitive or with a complex case marker (including an expletive noun) in the active sentence. Moreover, on the basis of this assumption, the reason why some indirect passives imply adversity can be clearly explained. The adversity in the indirect passive is not any construction meaning, but can be explained as just an amplified implication, which exists in the corresponding active.

The discussion in the text is summarized as follows. Firstly, the adversity in the passive has to be referred to as sprouting from the construal in the corresponding active. The objectively same situation can be construed either as adversary or non-adversary. Secondly, the adversity in the passive is just amplified, so that it cannot be present if it sprouts in the active. Finally the reason why the adversity is amplified though passivization is motivated by the experiential gestalt that the participant feels more unpleasant in the central position than in the peripheral position, when s/he is undesirably involved in the event which is predicated by the verb.

## NOTES

[ 1 ]Concerning the proper names used in the illustratory examples throughout this paper, *Taro* and *Jiro* are first names for Japanese males, while *Hanako* is a female's name. And the abbreviations are as follows: NOM=nominative postposition, ACC=accusative, DAT=dative, ABL=ablative, COM=comitative, INSTR=instrumental, GEN= genitive, TOP=topic postposition, PERF=perfective form, PASS=passive morpheme, CON=connective, PURP= purpose.

[ 2 ]The *ga*-marked NP, as well as the NP marked with another case, can be topicalized with the topic marker *-wa* in some contexts, but the difference between *-ga* and *-wa* is not relevant to the analysis in this paper.

[ 3 ]In addition, it has been noted that, morpho-syntactically, the indirect passive is derived from the intransitive sentence, whereas the direct passive is typically derived from the transitive sentence. More correctly speaking, however, the intransitive sentence can be changed only to the indirect passive, while the transitive active sentence can be changed into either the direct or the indirect passive, as Jacobsen(1991:93-98) maintains.

[ 4 ]It is generally accepted that the passive is the "marked" term with respect to the active. See Givón(1979:76) and

Comrie(1988:19-21), for specific grounds for passives being marked. Idiosyncratically, however, it is true that in English there is a verb like *rumor* that is almost always used in the passive voice.

[ 5 ]This paper is paradigmatically irrelevant to such positions as the Uniform Theory and the Non-uniform Theory in traditional generative grammar. Likewise, neither Masuoka(1982)'s distinction between the promotional passive and the demotional passive, nor Washio(1995)'s distinction between the exclusion passive and the inclusion passive has any crucial influence or impose any restrictions upon our present discussion.

[ 7 ]The Japanese passivization is so productive that various kinds of elements can be promoted, as shown later. Of course, not all the elements of the possible cases are passivized, but semantically limited.

[ 6 ]In all the sentences in (6), the dative element *Hanako* is the goal in meaning, not the agent.

[ 8 ]The dative can be passivized to the nominative, whether the accusative is explicitly present or not. This is also true of the ablative case in (7).

[ 9 ] As a related issue, Keenan(1975:348-349) tries to derive the passive in (a) from the active sentence in (b) below, which Song(1994:89) states to be unacceptable as a Japanese sentence.

    a.   *Taro-ga     Hanako-ni     niger-are-ta.*
        Taro-NOM   Hanako-DAT   escape-PASS-PERF
        "(lit.) Taro was run away on by Hanako."

    b.  *?Taro-wa     Hanako-ga     nige-ta.*
        Taro-TOP   Hanako-NOM   escape-PERF
        "(lit.)As for Taro, Hanako ran away."

    c.   *Hanako-ga     Taro-kara nige-ta.*
        Hanako-NOM   Taro-ABL  escape-PERF
        "Hanako ran away from Taro."

In this case, we can postulate such a natural active sentence as in (c), where the promoted nominative NP is marked with the ablative *-kara* case.

[10]Within the framework of relational grammar, Shimizu(1975) adopts the promotion of the genitive in the active to the nominative in the passive. Song(1987:75-77), from another point of view, also states that the possessor NP can be passivized.

[11] In this point our analysis is more explicit than that of Shibatani(1994:473-474), where such kind of ambiguity as in (16) cannot be explained in any formal way.

[12] In a situation like (22c), the *akachan* "baby" must not necessarily be crying over *Taro*, in opposition to Kortlandt(1992:103), but the sentence in (22c) is also acceptable in such a situation that the *akachan* "baby" started crying as *Taro* was coming near or did something to the baby, or if *Taro* had some difficulties in his work due to the baby's crying, as is suggested in Shibatani(1994:473-474).

[13] In (23b) the noun phrase *Taro-no-densha* "*Taro*'s train" should be interpreted as "the train in which Taro rides," not necessarily "the train which *Taro* possesses."

## REFERENCES

Comrie, Bernard   1988 "Passive and Voice," In Shibatani, Masayoshi(ed.), *Passive and Voice (Typological Studies in Language, Vol.16)*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.9-23.

Givón, Talmy   1979 *On Understanding Grammar.* New York: Academic Press.

Givón, Talmy   1990 *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction,* Vol.2, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Goldberg, A.E.   1995 *Constructions: a construction grammar approach to argument structure.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Howard, Irwin and Agnes M.Niyekawa-Howard
        1976 "Passivization," In Shibatani, M(ed.), *Japanese Generative Grammar (Syntax and Semantics, Vol.5)*, New York: Academic Press, pp.201-237.

Jacobsen, W. M.    1991 *The Transitive Structure of Events in Japanese*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.

Keenan, E. L.    1975 "Some universals of passive in relational grammar," *CLS*, 11, pp.340-352.

Kortlandt, F.    1992 "On the meaning of the Japanese passive," *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, 24, pp.97-108.

Kuno, Susumu    1973 *The Structure of Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Kuno, Susumu    1983 *Shin Nihon Bunpou Kenkyuu [New Research in Japanese Grammar]*. Tokyo: Taishuukan.

Lakoff, George    1987 *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, R.W.    1982 "Space Grammar, Analysability, and the English Passive," *Language*, 58, pp.22-80.

Langacker, R.W.    1987 *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol.1: Theoretical Prerequisites*: Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R.W.    1990 *Concept, Image, and Symbol (Cognitive Linguistics Research 1)*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Masuoka, Takashi 1982 "Nihongo judoubun no imi bunseki [On the Semantics of Japanese passives]," *Gengo Kenkyu* (Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan), Vol.82, pp.48-64.

Mikami, Akira    1972 *Gendai gohou josetsu [Preface to Modern Grammar]*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.

Nishimura, Yoshiki 1992 "Prolegomena to Cognitive Linguistics ( II ): Possibility of Semantics," *Annual Reports of Studies, The Faculty of Letters of Jissen Women's University*, Vol.34, pp. 17-39.

Oehrle, Richard T. and Hiroko Nishio
        1981 "Adversity," In Farmer, Ann Kathleen and Chisato Kitagawa(eds.) *Coyote Papers: Working papers in linguistics from a → z. Vol.2. Proceedings of the Arizona Conference on Japanese Linguistics: The formal grammar session*. University of Arizona. Tucson, pp.163-185.

Palmer, F.R.    1994 *Grammatical roles and relations (Cambridge textbooks in linguistics)*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Shibatani, M.    1978 *Nihongo-no Bunseki [An Analysis of the Japanese language]*. Tokyo: Taishuukan.

Shibatani, M.    1985 "Passives And Related Construction: A Prototype Analysis," *Language*, 61(4), pp.821-848.

Shibatani, M.    1990 *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Shibatani, M.    1994 "An integrational approach to possessor raising, ethical datives, and adversative passives," *BLS*, 20, pp.461-486.

Shimizu, Midori    1975 "Relational Grammar and Promotion Rules in Japanese," *CLS*, 11, pp.529-535.

Siewierska, Anna    1984 *The Passive: A Comparative Linguistic Analysis*. London; Dover, N.H: Croom Helm.

Song, Nam-Sun    1987 "Empathy-based affectedness and passivization," *Transactions of the philological Society*, pp.74-89.

Song, Nam-Sun    1994 *Thematic Relations and Transitivity in English, Japanese, and Korean*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Takami, Ken'ichi    1995 *Kinouteki koubunron-ni-yoru nichi-ei-go hikaku [Japanese-English comparison by the functional constructionalism]*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.

Teramura, Hideo    1982 *Nihongo-no shintakusu-to imi I [The syntax and semantics of Japanese I]*.Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.

Washio, Ryuichi    1995 *Interpreting voice: a case study in lexical semantics*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Wierzbicka, Anna    1988 *The semantics of grammar*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.