An Analysis of the Passive in Japanese: A Preliminary Study towards the Clarification of the Thematic Role *Theme**

Mariko Saiki
Department of English
College of Liberal Arts
Kanazawa University

0. Introduction

This paper assumes *the Lexical Mapping Theory* (LMT) (Bresnan and Kanerva (1989), Bresnan and Zaenen (1990), Alsina (1992), etc.) and introduces an analysis of the direct and the indirect passive constructions in Japanese. In what follows, we will refer to the adjunct or non-adjunct status of the *-ni* marked NPs[1] within passive sentences, and present an account of the *a(rgument)*-structures of the passive predicates with respect to the thematic roles therein found. We will then show that the above two types of passives primarily share the operation on the level of a-structures which has the effect of demoting the argument having the higher role in *the hierarchy of thematic roles*. More precisely, we will classify passive sentences in Japanese into four types and claim that one of them involves the *suppression* of such arguments as presented in the LMT literature, while the other three types exist as a consequence of another operation which embeds one a-structure into another. While doing so, a special emphasis will be put on the status of the thematic role *theme*. It will be pointed out that there is a possibility that the adversative or non-adversative readings associated with passives in Japanese will be clarified upon further investigation into the thematic role *theme* which is exhibited within passive a-structures.

1. Syntax and Semantics of the Passive in Japanese

1.1. An Overview

In addition to the English type of passive construction, i.e. one whose subject corresponds to the object of the active sentence as in (1), it has been widely discussed in the relevant literature that there is syntactically another type of passive construction in Japanese which does not have corresponding active sentences as exemplified in (2) below.[2]

(1) a. Taro-ga Hanako-ni home-rare-ta. (Passive)
Taro-NOM Hanako-ni praise-PASS-Past
'Taro was praised by Hanako.'

b. Hanako-ga Taro-o home-ta. (Active)
Hanako-NOM Taro-ACC praise-Past
'Hanako praised Taro.'

(2) a. Taro-ga hahaoya-ni shin-are-ta.
Taro-NOM mother-ni die-PASS-Past
'Taro's mother died on him.'

b. Taro-ga doroboo-ni jitensya-o nusum-are-ta.
Taro-NOM thief-ni bicycle-ACC steal-PASS-Past
'Taro had his bicycle stolen by a thief.'

Both types of passive constructions in (1) and (2) above involve the morpheme *-(r)are* (glossed PASS above and hereafter) which ensures the reading that the subject of the sentence is directly or indirectly affected by the action or the event expressed in the rest of the sentence. Thus, the first type of passive sentences is called *the direct passive construction* and the second type *the indirect passive construction.* Furthermore, within the transformational approach, the former was derived from a mono-clausal underlying structure, while the latter was analyzed to have a bi-clausal structure in the course of its derivational history.

Semantically, it has been argued that there are two classes of passive sentences in Japanese: *the adversative passive* and *the pure passive.* The former has been noted to have an implication that the subject of the sentence is adversely affected by the action

or the event within the sentence, while this reading is not available in the latter type of passive sentences. The passive sentence in (1) and the examples in (2) are instances of the pure passive and the adversative passive respectively. It was once claimed that the semantic distinction between the pure passive and the adversative passive was captured by positing different underlying structures. Thus, linguists have tried to derive the pure and the adversative passives by positing the underlying structures for the direct passive and the indirect passive constructions respectively. This approach, however, was deemed impossible given the presence of the following two instances of passive sentences. The first is the presence of adversative passive sentences which syntactically show the pattern for the direct passive construction, thus, having the corresponding active sentences. The second is the presence of indirect passive sentences which lack the adversative implication on the part of their subjects, and which are thus classified as pure passive sentences. Accordingly, the one-to-one correspondence between the direct passive and the pure passive, and also between the indirect passive and the adversative passive have been denied. Sentences in (3), taken from Kuno (1983), show direct passive sentences with adversative readings on the part of the subjects. Sentences in (4), also from Kuno (1983), list examples of indirect passive sentences without the readings in which the subjects are not adversely affected.

(3) the direct passive+the adversative passive

a. Hawai-daigaku-wa、 John-ni、 1960-nen-ni nyuugakus-are-ta.
U. of Hawaii-TOP John-ni 1969-year-in enter school-PASS-Past
'The University of Hawaii was affected by the event of John entering it in 1960.'

b. Hawai-daigaku-wa、 John-ni、 1960-nen-ni sar-are-ta.
U. of Hawaii-TOP John-ni 1969-year-in leave-PASS-Past
'The University of Hawaii was affected by the event of John leaving it in 1960.'

c. Hawai-daigaku-wa、 John-ni、 1960-nen-ni sotsugyoos-are-ta.
U. of Hawaii-TOP John-ni 1969-year-in graduate-PASS-Past
'The University of Hawaii was affected by the event of John graduating from it in 1960.'

d. Mary-wa、 John-ni ni-rare-te、 kimochi-waru-gat-te-i-ru.
Mary-TOP John-ni resemble-PASS-? feeling-bad-VM-GM-be-Pres
'Mary is feeling bad, being affected by the state of John resembling her.'

e. Hawai-daigaku-wa、 Sato-sensei-ni yame-rare-ta.
U. of Hawaii-TOP Sato-Prof. -ni quit-PASS-Past
'The University of Hawaii is affected by the event of Prof. Sato quitting it.'

(Kuno (1983))

(4) the indirect passive+the pure passive

a. Yamada-wa、 Tanaka-kyooju-ni gyooseki-o mitome-rare-ta.
Yamada-TOP Tanaka-Prof.-ni achievement-ACC think highly of-Pass-Past
'Yamada had Prof. Tanaka think highly of his achievement.'

b. Yamada-roojin-wa、 musume-ni ashi-o sasur-are-nagara、
Yamada-old person-TOP daughter-ni leg-ACC rub-PASS-while
utoutoshi-te-i-ta.
doze off-GM-be-Past
'Old Yamada was about to fall asleep, feeling good having his legs rubbed by his daughter.'

c. Yamada-kyooju-wa、 hyooronka-ni aidea-no atarashisa-to bunsai -o
Yamada-Prof.-TOP critic-ni idea-GEN newness-and literary talent-ACC
takaku hyookas-are-te-i-ru.
highly evaluate-PASS-GM-be-Pres
'Prof. Yamada has had the creativity of his ideas and his talent in writing evaluatedas excellent by critics. '

d. Yamada-kyooju-wa、 gakkai-kankeisya-ni sono gakushiki-o
Tamada-Prof.-TOP academia-participant-ni his knowledge-ACC
tow-are-te-i-ru.
doubt-PASS-GM-be-Pres
'Prof. Yamada has the academia doubting his academic knowledge.'

e. Yamada-wa、 syatyoo-ni higoro-no seikin-o hyoosyoos-are-ta.
Yamada-TOP president-ni usual-GEN hard work-ACC commend-PASS-Past
'Yamada had the president of his company commend him for his usual hard work.'

(Kuno (1983))

1.2. The Status of *-ni* marked NPs in the Japanese Passive

There are two points of note which the *-ni* marked NPs in (3) all seem to share. First, the *-ni* marked NPs in (3) all carry the thematic role *theme*. According to Bresnan and Kanerva (1989), theme is 'the argument of which location or state is predicated, or change of location or state...' is predicated. Given this characterization of theme, since the verbs *nyuugaku-s(uru)* 'enter school', *sar(u)* 'leave', *sotugyoo-s(ru)* 'graduate', *yame(ru)* 'quit' whose passivized forms appear in respective (3. a), (3. b), (3. c), and (3. e) respectively ensure that the change of state or location is predicated of their subjects, the underlined *-ni* marked NPs are identified as theme. In addition, the subject of the verb *ni(ru)* 'resemble' which appears in (3.d) is also deemed to carry the role theme because its independent state is predicated of by the verb. Thus, the *-ni* marked NP in (3.d) is considered to be analyzed as theme.

The other characteristic which the *-ni* marked NPs in (3) all share is that if they are deleted, the rest of the sentence somehow sounds elliptical. (5) below is given in order to illustrate this point. The absence of *-ni* marked NPs is expressed in terms of the symbol ϕ.

(5) a. *Hawai-daigaku-wa、 ϕ 1960-nen-ni nyuugakus-are -ta.
b. *Hawai-daigaku-wa、 ϕ 1960-nen-ni sar-are-ta.
c. *Hawai-daigaku-wa、 ϕ 1960-nen-ni sotsugyoos-are-ta.
d. *Mary-wa、 ϕ ni-rare-te、 kimochi-waru-gat-te-i-ru.
e. *Hawai-daigaku-wa 、 ϕ yame-rare-ta.

Following Miyagawa (1989), we will assume the distinction between an adjunct and a syntactic argument of a verb to be such that the former is deletable out of a sentence while the absence of the latter leads to ungrammaticality. Hence, the NPs marked with *-ni* in (3), (noting that the sentences are ungrammatical after their deletion as shown in (5)), are syntactic arguments of the passive predicates.

It is important to notice here that the status of *-ni* marked NPs within the direct passive sentences as syntactically undeletable arguments seems to be limited to the cases where they are identified as carrying the thematic role theme. In other words, the *-ni* marked NPs within direct passive sentences which carry the role other than theme are deletable, thus no ungrammaticality occurs with their absence. Consider (6)

below.

(6) a. Taro-ga (gakusei-ni) koros -are-ta.
Taro-NOM (student-ni) kill-PASS-Past
'Taro was killed (by a student).'

b. Taro-ga (minna-ni) urayamashi-gar-are-ta.
Taro-NOM (everybody-ni) envy-VM-PASS-Past
'Taro was envied (by everybody).'

c. Taro-ga (kuruma-ni) hik-are-ta.
Taro-NOM (car-ni) hit-PASS-Past
'Taro was hit (by a car).'

In the examples in (6), *gakusei-ni* 'by a student', *minna-ni* 'by everybody', and *kuruma-ni* 'by a car' have the thematic roles *agent*, *experiencer*, and *instrument* respectively and they are adjuncts syntactically in that they are deletable from the sentences. Furthermore, these passive sentences are semantically pure passives without any implication of adversity on the part of their subjects. Note, also, that there are other instances of the direct passive sentences as in (7) where their *-ni* marked NPs have the thematic role *agent*. In these cases, again, just like the examples in (6), the *-ni* marked NPs are identified as adjuncts since their deletion does not change the grammaticality of the sentences as shown in (8). These sentences are, however, semantically adversative passives unlike those in (6).

(7) a. Sato-wa butyoo-ni jinjika-ni mawas-are -ta.
Sato-TOP section chief-ni personnel section-to send-PASS-Past
'Sato was adversely affected by the event of his section chief sending him to the personnel section.'

b. Michiko-wa Kato-san-ni kuni-ni kaes-are-ta.
Michiko-TOP Kato-Mr.-ni hometown-to send back-PASS-Past
'Michiko was adversely affected by the event of Mr. Kato sending her back to her hometown. '

(Howard and Niyekawa-Howard (1976))

(8) a. Sato-waϕ jinjika-ni mawas-are-ta.
Sato-TOP personnel section-to send-PASS-Past
'Sato was sent to the personnel section.'

b. Michiko-waϕ kuni-ni kaes-are-ta.
Michiko-TOP hometown-to send back-PASS-Past
'Michiko was sent back to her hometown.'

We have so far discussed the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the NPs marked with *-ni* in the Japanese direct passive sentences, and the generalization here is the following : the *-ni* marked NP with the thematic role theme within the Japanese direct passive is a syntactic argument, while the one with a role other than theme is an adjunct syntactically. The passive sentences with *-ni* marked theme are adversative passives, whereas the passive sentences with *-ni* marked NPs carrying roles other than theme are either adversative or pure passives.

Interestingly, the above generalization as to the argument/adjunct and adversative/pure status of the *-ni* marked NPs seems to apply also to the cases for the indirect passive sentences. Consider (9) and (10) below.

(9) a. Taro-ga *(hahaoya-ni) shin-are-ta.
Taro-NOM *(mother-ni) die -PASS-Past
'Taro had *(his mother) die on him.'

b. Taro-ga *(Hanako-ni) musume-ni ai-ni-ko-rare-ta.
Taro-NOM *(Hanako-ni) daughter-to meet-to-come-PASS-Past
'Taro had *(Hanako) come over to meet his daughter.'

c. Taro-ga *(Hanako-ni) kaisya -o yame-rare-ta.
Taro-NOM *(Hanako-ni) company-ACC quit-PASS-Past
'Taro had *(Hanako) quit the company.'

(10) a. Taro-ga (doroboo-ni) jitensya-o nusum-are-ta.
Taro-NOM (thief-ni) bicycle-ACC steal-PASS-Past
'Taro had his bicycle stolen (by a thief).'

b. Taro-ga (dookyuusei-ni) sinsya-o urayamashi-gar-are-ta.
Taro-NOM (classmate-ni) new car-ACC envious-VM-PASS-Past
'Taro is envied for his new car (by his classmates).'

c. Taro-ga ? (kuruma-ni) musuko-o hik -are-ta.
Taro-NOM ? (car-ni) son-ACC hit-PASS-Past
'Taro had his son hit (by a car).'

Note that the *-ni* marked NPs in (9) all carry the thematic role theme, and these sentences sound elliptical without them. Also, these passive sentences are the adversative passive. On the other hand, (10. a), (10. b) and (10. c) have agent, experiencer, and instrument marked with *-ni* respectively, and are adversative passive sentences. The same type of passive sentences are listed in (4) whose *-ni* marked NPs are identified as carrying roles other than theme. However, these passive sentences are not considered as being associated with the adversative reading. In addition, as far as (10. a) and (10. b) are concerned, the absence of these NPs does not cause ungrammaticality in the rest of the sentences. However, native speakers' grammatical judgements differ as to the absence of the instrument NP in (10. c), which is expressed in terms of the symbol ? next to the parenthesis. We will discuss this point in section 2. 5.

1.3. Summary of Section 1

To conclude this section, consider the following three points about the classification of the Japanese passive sentences. First, each of the direct passive and the indirect passive sentences which have been discussed in the literature is classified into two types: one whose *-ni* marked argument carries the role theme and the other whose corresponding NP is identified as carrying a role other than theme. Second, the *-ni* marked NPs in the former type of passive sentences are syntactically arguments of the passive predicates, while those in the latter type are adjuncts. Third, the former type of passive sentences involves an adversative reading, whereas the latter type has either an adversative or a pure reading. These points are summarized in the chart in (11) below.[3]

(11)

	Type	θof NP-ni	status of NP-ni (adjunct/argument)	reading (adversative/pure)
direct passive	A	θ≫th/pt	adjunct	adversative/pure
	B	theme	argument	adversative
indirect passive	C	θ≫th/pt	adjunct	adversative/pure
	D	theme	argument	adversative

2. An Analysis of the Passive in Japanese

2.1. The Theory of A-structures in LFG

The Lexical Mapping Theory (LMT) assumes that there is a semantic structure of a predicate which underlies the surface syntactic expression of the arguments on the level of f-structures. This structure is called the *a-structure* (*argument*-structure) of a predicate where the prominence of argument roles is expressed in the left to right order which reflects the ordering of roles on the universal hierarchy of thematic roles shown in (12).

(12) Hierarchy of Thematic Roles:

ag(ent) > ben(efactor) > go(al)/exp(eriencer) > inst(rument) >
th(eme)/p(atien)t > loc(ative)

Grammatical functions are further decomposed into the syntactic features [±r(estricted)] and [±o(bject)] as in (13) below, which designate whether a given argument is semantically restricted or not and objectlike or not respectively. Furthermore, each role in an a-structure is analyzed as having one of these features intrinsically. This mapping between the roles and the features is unmarked, conforming to the generalization found across languages. For example, the agent is intrinsically associated with the feature [−o], capturing the generalization that it cannot appear

as an object on the surface (*the agent encoding principle*, Bresnan and Kanerva (1989)), while the theme is always found as a surface subject or an object, thus analyzed as having an unmarked feature [−r] (*the theme encoding principle*, Bresnan and Kanerva (1989)).

(13) SUBJ: $\begin{bmatrix} -r \\ -o \end{bmatrix}$ OBJ: $\begin{bmatrix} -r \\ +o \end{bmatrix}$ OBJ θ: $\begin{bmatrix} +r \\ +o \end{bmatrix}$ OBL θ: $\begin{bmatrix} +r \\ -o \end{bmatrix}$

In addition, the roles in the a-structures are identified as either an *external argument* or an *internal argument* based on the feature with which each of them is associated. Internal arguments are intrinsically classified with the feature [−r] or [+o] where [+o] is optionally available to the roles which are lower than the goal on the hierarchy of thematic roles in (12), whereas external arguments are identified as the non-internal arguments which are highest on the thematic hierarchy and which are not classified in terms of the features [−r] or [+o] (Alsina (1992)).

The roles on the a-structures are assigned further features by the mapping principles as in (14) which is the version from Alsina (1992). The Subject Principle in (14. i) identifies the subject argument of an a-structure based on the assumption that every language has subjects. Also, this principle captures the fact which is observed across languages that external arguments are realized as subjects rather than internal arguments. The argument in an a-structure which is still underspecified, that is, the argument which is not specified with features after the Subject Principle applies, is assigned a feature by means of the Default Principle in (14. ii).

(14) Mapping Principles:

(i) Subject Principle (Alsina (1992))
Assign the subject features ([−r], [−o]) to
a. the external argument; otherwise to
b. an internal argument

(ii) Default Principle (Alsina (1992))
Complete a partially specified syntactic function by assigning a positive value to the unspecified syntactic feature ([r] or [o]).

There are three kinds of operations on the level of a-structures that have been identified in LMT. The first such operation is *suppression*. The passive which is found elsewhere in natural languages involves this operation, where the suppression of the highest role ($\hat{\theta}$) within the a-structure takes place referring to the thematic hierarchy. This is expressed with the notation shown in (15) below, where the suppressed argument appears outside the angle brackets being co-indexed with an argument inside the a-structure.

(15) Passive: $< \hat{\theta}_i \ . \ . \ . > \ (\theta_i \ )$
ϕ

The passive is a case of *morphologically specified suppression* or *morphological suppression* in that it is triggered by affixation in the morphology. There is another kind of suppression which is called *morphologically unspecified suppression* or *syntactic suppression* as exemplified in the analysis of the causative in Chicheŵa (Alsina (1992)). This kind of suppression takes place when an argument which has not been assigned any syntactic features by the mapping principles. In both cases of suppression above, the suppressed argument is unable to relate to the syntax any more, and thus it is given no surface syntactic function. However, it is semantically related to the a-structure as an adjunct, or an *a-adjunct* in the LMT term. As a result, no elliptical reading occurs even in the absence of a-adjuncts.

The second operation on a-structures is addition where an argument is added to an a-structure as in the case of applicatives in Chicheŵa (Alsina and Mchombo (1988)). Lastly, the *fusion* of a-structures accounts for the cases of complex predicates which are seen in the analyses of the *-te aru* construction in Japanese (Matsumoto (1990)) and the causatives in Chicheŵa (Alsina (1992)), where an a-structure is embedded within an outer a-structure and one of the arguments in the outer a-structure is fused with an argument within the inner a-structure to share the same syntactic function on the surface. In these cases, one of the arguments in the outer a-structure is mapped onto the surface subject function by the Subject Principle in (14. i).

Now that the roles placed in an a-structure have received full specification of syntactic features, the mapping of each role in the a-structure onto a surface grammatical function is complete. The resulting lexical form is evaluated as to its well -formedness by the criteria given in (16).

(16) Well-formedness Conditions:

(i) Subject Condition: One of the arguments in the lexical form must be a subject.

(ii) Function-Argument Biuniqueness: There must be one-to-one correspondence between arguments and functions.

2.2. An LMT Account of the Japanese Passive

In the following discussion, we present our analysis of the passive in Japanese. More precisely, we will posit three different a-structures for the four types of passive sentences (Types A, B, C, and D) which we discussed in the previous section. While doing so, let us recall the facts about the status of *-ni* marked NPs found in the four kinds of passive sentences summarized in chart (11).

It is obvious that Type A passive sentences conform to the operation on a-structures in the universal rule of the passive given in (15) above, aside from the adversative or pure semantic interpretations which are available according to the context. As we discussed in section 1. 2, these passive sentences are direct passive sentences having corresponding active sentences as in the case of the English passive. Moreover, since the absence of *-ni* marked NPs in Type A passive sentences does not change the grammaticality of the sentences, these NPs are identified as a-adjuncts which are semantically bound to the a-structures. Therefore, the a-structure as well as the relevant operation for the Type A passive can be expressed as in (17).

(17) A-Structure of the Type A Passive:

$$\begin{array}{l} < \hat{\theta}_i \ldots > (\theta_i \ \underline{-ni}) \\ \quad | \\ \quad \phi \qquad \text{where } \hat{\theta} > \text{th/pt} \end{array}$$

e. g. Taro-ga (gakusei-ni) koros -are -ta. (=(6.a))
Taro-ga (Hanako-ni) urayamashi-gar -are-ta. (=(6.b))
Taro-ga (kuruma-ni) hik-are-ta. (=(6.c))

In (17), the identification of the thematic role which appears as $\hat{\theta}$ is described by the symbol > , which is to be read 'be placed higher on the thematic hierarchy than th/pt.' Here, we restrict the thematic role which appears as $\hat{\theta}$ in this a-structure to being higher than theme or patient on the hierarchy of thematic roles in (12). This is based on the fact pointed out in section 1. 2. that the roles which appear as the *-ni* marked NP in the Type A passive exclude the theme role, and all such thematic roles are placed higher than theme on the hierarchy.[4]

Next, just like the Type A passive construction, the *-ni* marked NPs in Type C passive sentences are considered as a-adjuncts in that they can be freely deleted without causing ungrammaticality in the rest of the sentence. In addition, both types of passives have either adversative or pure interpretations on the part of their subjects. However, the syntactic difference between these two types of passive is that the former is analyzed as the direct passive while the latter as the indirect passive in traditional terms. Thus, the subjects of Type C passive sentences are associated with the reading that they are indirectly affected by the event or the state described in the rest of the sentences. This point has been one of the targets of the traditional analyses of the Japanese indirect passive and it has been claimed that the event or state in question is structurally a clause itself in the course of its derivation. Furthermore, this idea led linguists to the bi-clausal analysis of the indirect passive sentences in Japanese. In our current analysis, we will capture the nature of the event or the state by which the subjects of Type C passive sentences are affected in terms of an a-structure where the participants in the event or the state are represented with thematic roles. Hence, we will posit a structure in which such an a-structure appears inside another a-structure. See (18) below.

(18) A-Structure of the Type C passive :

$$< \text{th} \quad <\hat{\theta}_i \quad ...>>(\theta_i \quad -ni)$$

where $\hat{\theta}$ > th/pt

e. g. Taro-ga (doroboo-ni) jitensya-o nusum-are-ta. (=(10.a))
Taro-ga (dookyuusei-ni) sinsya-o uayamashi-gar-are-ta. (=(10.b))
Taro-ga ?(kuruma-ni) musuko-o hik-are-ta. (=(10.c))

In the structure assumed in (18), the a-structure of a passive predicate is shown as an outer a-structure which is a bi-place predicate consisting of the following two arguments. One is an argument which is mapped onto the subject of a corresponding passive sentence which is an affected argument, and the other, which takes the form of an a-structure, expresses the event or the state which affects the subject of the passive predicate. Note that the argument in the outer a-structure which is to be mapped onto the subject of the passive predicate is identified with the role theme. We will discuss this point in section 2. 3 below.

The type D passive construction conforms to the a-structure form which is assumed for the Type C passive sentences above, where an affected argument is expressed as theme and the event or state which affects this argument is expressed by an included a-structure. However, unlike the Type C passive construction, the *-ni* marked NP in the Type D passive cannot be deleted from the sentence. Thus, it is considered as a syntactic argument of the passive predicate. Also, as we mentioned in section 1. 2, it is identified as carrying the role theme. In order to capture these points, we will posit the a-structure in (20) for the Type D passive sentences. The argument in the outer a-structure is identified as theme as well, which is subject to the discussion in section 2. 3 below.

(19) A-Structure of the Type D Passive:

$$< \text{th} < \text{th} \quad (\text{loc}) >>$$

e. g. Taro-ga * (hahaoya-ni) shin-are-ta. (=(2.a)+(9.a))
Taro-ga * (Hanako-ni) musume-ni ai-ni-ko-rare-ta. (=(9.b))
Taro-ga * (Hanako-ni) kaisya-o yame-rare-ta. (=(9.c))

Let us note that it is not the case that any a-structure whose $\hat{\theta}$ is theme appears as an inner a-structure of this rule. Consider the contrast between (20. a) and (20. b).

(20) a. Taro-wa Hanako-ni zutto soba-ni i-rare-ta.
Taro-TOP Hanako-ni for a long time by the side stay-PASS-Past
'Taro had Hanako stay beside him for a long time.'

b. * Taro-wa Hanako-no kaban-ni zutto tukue-no ue-ni
Taro-TOP Hanako-GEN bag-ni for a long time on the desk
a-rare-ta.
exist-PASS-Past
'Taro had Hanako's bag kept on his desk for a long time.'

(20. a) and (20. b) contain the verbs *i(ru)* and *a(ru)* respectively, which both mean 'to exist'. In addition, they both take theme as their subjects. However, the difference between these two verbs is that the former is used when the subject is animate, while the latter is used when the subject is non-animate. Given the fact that besides (20. a), all the other grammatical Type D passive sentences presented in section 1. 2. (see (9)) have animate themes as their *-ni* marked arguments, we might want to limit our analysis so that the theme as $\hat{\theta}$ in the inner a-structure of (19) is restricted to the animate theme. However, there exist examples of animate theme which cannot occur in the same position. Consider the following ungrammatical examples.

(21) a. * Taro-wa kakumat-te-i-ta satsujinhan-ni keisatsu-ni
Taro-Top harbor-GM-be-Past murderer-ni police-ni be
tsukamar-are-ta.
arrested-Pass-Past
'Taro had the murderer whom he was harboring arrested by the police.'

b. * Sono jyoyuu-wa kakushigo-ni mitsukar-are-ta.
That-actress-Top illegitimate child-ni be found out-Pass-Past
'That actress had her illegitimate child found out (by others).'

(21. a) and (21. b) are examples of the sentences where the verbs *tsukamar(u)* 'be arrested' and *mitsukar(u)* 'be found' are passivized respectively. They are assumed to have the a-structure of the form $< ag_i$ th $> (ag_i)$, where agent appears as an optional a-adjunct. Note that the theme argument in this a-structure is mapped onto the animate NPs in the above two sentences. More precisely, it appears, marked by-*ni*, as the animate NPs *kakumat-te-i-ta satsujinnhan* 'the murderer whom Taro was harboring' and *kakushigo* 'her (that actress') illegitimate child' in (21. a) and (21. b) respectively. However, unlike (20. a), the two passive sentences in (21) are ungrammatical. Thus, it is obvious that we must refer to a further characteristic of theme

in the inner a-structure of (19) other than just labeling it as animate theme. Rather, we should identify it as a theme which has the ability to control the situation described by the passive predicate. For our current purposes, however, we will not specifically refer to such a subgrouping of theme.[5]

Lastly, in order to capture the valid a-structure for the Type B construction, we need to pay further attention to its syntactic characterization. (22) is the same as (3), which illustrates the passive sentences of this type.

(22) a. Hawai-daigaku-wa、 * (John-ni) 1960-nen-ni nyuugakus-are-ta.
b. Hawai-daigaku-wa、 * (John-ni) 1960-nen-ni sar-are-ta.
c. Hawai-daigaku-wa、 * (John-ni) 1960-nen-ni sotsugyoos-are-ta.
d. Mary-wa、 * (John-ni) ni-rare-te、 kimochi-waru-gat-te-i-ru.
e. Hawai-daigaku-wa、 * (Sato-sensei-ni) yame-rare-ta.

There seem to be three points to consider in order to get at the relevant a-structure for the Type B passive. First, the *-ni* marked NPs in Type B passive sentences are syntactic arguments given their undeletability out of the sentences. Second, they are identified with the role theme as we mentioned in section 1. 2. Third, the subjects *Hawai-daigaku* 'the University of Hawaii' in (22. a, b, c, e) and *Mary* in (22. d) are the locative arguments in the corresponding active predicates.

Given the first point above, that is, the fact that the *-ni* marked NP in this type of passive construction is a syntactic argument, it is obvious that its a-structure and the relevant operation on the a-structure conform to neither the universal rule of passivization in (15) nor (17). Alsina and Mchombo (1988) discuss the case where Chicheŵa theme cannot be suppressed in passivization as formulated in (15). If we take only the second and the third points above into account, we could say that the Type B passive illustrates the case where theme was subjected to suppression by passivization in (15). However, as we mentioned above, it is not the application of (15) that has derived type B passive sentences. If it were so, their *-ni* marked NPs would be freely deletable out of the sentences as a-adjuncts. Hence, nothing prevents us from stating the following generalization about Japanese: in Japanese it is impossible for passivization in (15) to suppress theme just like the case in Chicheŵa. Thus, in order to account for the Type B passive construction in Japanese, we will posit an a-structure in (23) which is similar to that for the Type D passive below.

(23) A-Structure of the Type B Passive :

$$< \overline{th < th\ loc} >>$$

e. g. Hawai-daigaku-wa、 * (John-ni)、 1960-nen-ni nyuugakus-are-ta.
(=(3.a)+(5.a))
Hawai-daigaku-wa、 * (John-ni)、 1960-nen-ni sar-are-ta. (=(3.b)+(5.b))
Hawai-daigaku-wa、 * (John-ni)、 1960-nen-ni sotsugyoos-are-ta.
(=(3.c)+(5.c))

Note that in the a-structure in (23), fusion between the theme in the outer a -structure and the locative in the inner a-structure is expressed in terms of the line which connects these two arguments.

In this way, we capture the third characteristic of the Type B passive mentioned above, i. e. the fact that the locative argument in the active predicate is understood as the subject of the Type B passive sentence.

2. 3. Theme as the Subject of the Type B, C, and D Passives

It has been argued that the subjects of adversative passive sentences should be identified as having the role experiencer (Miyagawa (1989), Song(1993)). The reason for this analysis is that there is a reading where the subjects of the adversative passive sentences are psychologically damaged or are feeling troubled. However, this approach ignores the generalization where the forms of a-structures capture the active -passive alternation. For example, consider (7. a), which is repeated in (24. a) below, and whose corresponding active sentence is shown in (24. b).

(24) a. Sato-wa butyoo-ni jinjika-ni mawas-are -ta.
Sato-TOP section chief-ni personnel section-to send-PASS-Past
'Sato was affected by the event of the section chief sending him to the personnel section.'

b. Butyoo-ga Sato-o jinjika -ni mawas-ita.
section chief-NOM Sato-ACC personnel section-to send-Past
'The section chief sent Sato to the personnel section.'

In the analysis under consideration, it would be argued that the subject *Sato* in (24. a), which is a direct passive sentence of Type A above, is an experiencer based on the adversative reading on the part of this argument. However, in the active counterpart of this sentence in (24. b), the object *Sato*'s feeling is not reported at all. Rather, we should say that the feeling of gratefulness on the part of Sato is read in (24. b) by some people, due not to a reading taken directly from the grammar, but because of the general understanding in the culture which considers transferral to the personnel section as a promotion within the company. Thus, the analysis in question would have to posit different a-structures for the passive and active verbs where different sets of thematic roles are found. That is, one with an experiencer role (for the former), and the other without (using theme instead) for the latter. Moreover, according to Bresnan and Kanerva's (1991) definition of roles, since both the subject *Sato* in (24. a) and the object *Sato* in (24. b) are analyzed as theme, the change of situation and location is reported on the part of these arguments. Thus, without relying on the experiencer role for the explanation of adversative reading which is available in certain passive sentences, we will take the position that the argument in question is associated with the role theme. We hypothesize, instead, that the adversative reading originates from the yet to be explicated characteristic of theme. More specifically, we will take the position in which we attribute the adversative reading to theme when it is mapped onto a subject in the syntax as in the cases representative of the passive constructions in Japanese.[6]

2. 4. How the Analysis in 2. 2. Works

(25) is shown to account for the Type A passive construction. In the a-structure in (25), the highest role on the hierarchy of thematic roles ($\hat{\theta}$) is the agent. The suppression of this role is triggered by the affixation of the passive morpheme *-(r)are* in passivization. Since the other role, patient, within the a-structure is classified as an internal argument, it receives the feature [−r]. Also, after the agent is suppressed, there is no external argument in the a-structure. Therefore the Subject Principle

in (15. b) applies to the patient argument and it maps this argument onto the subject of the passive predicate. The suppressed agent is shown in parentheses outside the angle brackets signifying that it is now a semantically bound a-adjunct and its occurrence is optional in order for the sentence to be complete.

(25) demonstration of (17) : *koros-are-ru*

$$< \ ag_i \ \ pt \ > \ (\ ag_i \ \textit{-ni})$$

Int.Arg.: | | | | | [−r]

Passive -(r)are: ϕ

Subj.Pr.: [−o]

SUBJ

Taro-ga (gakusei-ni) koros-are-ta. (=(6.a))

Next, see (26), which is the a-structure for the Type C passive.

(26) demonstration of (18) : *nusum-are-ru*

$$< \text{th} \ < \ ag_i \ \ \text{th} \ >>(\ ag_i \ \textit{-ni})$$

Int.Arg.: [−r]

Subj.Pr.: $\begin{bmatrix} -o \\ -r \end{bmatrix}$

Def.Pr.: [+o]

SUBJ OBJ

Taro-ga (doroboo-ni) jitensya-o nusum-are-ta. (=(10.a))

Because of the application of the Subject Principle in (14. i. b), theme in the outer a-structure is assigned the features [−o, −r]. The agent argument in the inner a -structure, which is mapped onto the-*ni* marked NP *doroboo-ni* on the surface, is not considered as an external argument within the passive a-structure as a whole.

Moreover, it is not an internal argument either. Accordingly, it does not receive the subject features by the Subject Principle in (14. i). As a result, no syntactic features are assigned to this argument and consequently morphologically unspecified (or syntactic) suppression takes place, which explains its status as a semantically bound a -adjunct.

(27) is the a-structure for the Type D passive sentences whose-ni marked NPs are theme.

(27) demonstration of (19): *sin-are-ru* and *yame-rare-ru*

	< th < th (loc) >>
Int. Arg.:	[+ o] [−r]
Sub. Pr.:	$\begin{bmatrix} -o \\ -r \end{bmatrix}$
Def.Pr.:	[+ r] [+o]
	SUBJ OBJ_θ (OBJ)

Taro-ga *(hahaoya -ni) shin -are -ta. (= (9.a))

Taro-ga *(Hanako -ni) kaisya -o yame -rare-ta. (=(9.c))

In (27), the theme argument in the inner a-structure is not suppressed syntactically. Just like (26) above, the Subject Principle in (14. i. b) assigns the features [−o, −r] to the theme argument in the outer a-structure. However, unlike (26), the *-ni* marked NP for the passive of this type is theme which appears in the inner a-structure in (27). Also, this argument is classified as an internal argument by definition. Thus, it receives the feature [+o],[7] and finally, the Default Principle applies and assigns the feature [+r] to this argument. In this way, the syntactic realization of this argument on the surface as well as its status as an undeletable syntactic argument are explained. When the locative argument appears in the embedded a-structure, it is intrinsically associated with the feature [−r].[8] In addition, because of the application of the Default Principle in (14. ii), it is assigned the feature [+o]. Hence, the realization of this argument in syntax is ensured as illustrated in (27) above.

Lastly, consider (28) which illustrates how the Type B passive is explained in

terms of our a-structure in (23).

(28) demonstration of (23) : *sotsugyoos-are-ru* and *ni*-rare-ru

$$\begin{array}{lll} & < \text{th} < \text{th} & \text{loc} >> \\ \text{Int. Arg.:} & & [+\text{o}] \\ \text{Sub. Pr.:} & \begin{bmatrix} -\text{o} \\ -\text{r} \end{bmatrix} & \\ \text{Def.Pr.:} & & [+\text{r}] \end{array}$$

SUBJ OBJ $_{\theta}$

Hawai -daigaku-wa、 * (John-ni)、 1960-nen-ni sotsugyoos-are-ta. (=(22.c))
Mary-wa 、 * (John-ni) ni-rare-te、 kimochi-waru-gat -te-i-ru. (=(22.d))

In (28), the theme of the passive predicate is fused with the locative argument of the embedded a-structure. Just like the case in (22), the theme in the outer a-structure is mapped onto the surface subject by the application of the Subject Principle in (14. i. b). As for the theme argument in the inner a-structure, as in (22) above, its syntactic expression on the surface is explained due to its nature as an internal argument which is classified with the feature [+o]. Then, the Default Principle in (14. ii) further assigns the feature [+r] to this argument and the mapping of this argument to the syntactic function OBJ$_{\theta}$ is accounted for.

2. 5. More on the Type C, and D Passives

We showed in the previous section that our analysis readily explains that the theme argument in the inner a-structure for the Type D passive is a syntactic argument of the passive predicate. Recall that this is so construed in our analysis where the theme argument, unlike the agent in (26), (which is an instance of the Type C passive construction), is intrinsically associated with the feature for an internal argument. Based on this, it might be expected in our theory that the *-ni* marked NP of a passive predicate is a syntactic argument given that it is an internal argument,

whereas if it is an external argument, this NP is an a-adjunct. If we examine the data presented earlier in this paper once again, we see that there is at least a tendency that our prediction is correct. The example in (10. c) is repeated in (29).

(29) Taro-ga ? (kuruma-ni) musuko-o hik-are -ta.
Taro-NOM ? (car-ni) son-ACC hit-PASS-Past
'Taro had (a car) hit his son.'

Some of our informants pointed out that the sentence sounds marginal, if not completely ungrammatical, without *kuruma-ni* in (29), although others agreed that this sentence is grammatical with or without this NP. There has been an analysis elsewhere in the literature in which *The car* in the sentence *The car hit Mary* is classified as an instrument. Or, in some cases, the same argument is analyzed as an agent as in Schlesinger (1989). Following the former kind of analysis, we have so far dealt with the NP *kuruma-ni* in (29) as carrying the role instrument. However, considering the facts about the grammatical judgements above, we are led to think that there are the following two kinds of native speakers of Japanese : ones who perceive *kuruma-ni* as the agent, and others who perceive it as the instrument. For the former kind of native speakers, because this phrase, as an external argument, is syntactically suppressed making it a semantically bound a-adjunct, it is undeletable out of the sentence. In contrast, for the latter kind of native speakers, since an instrument is an internal argument and is not subject to the syntactic suppression, the ungrammaticality of the sentence without this NP is explained.

However, if we consider the example in (10. b) which is repeated in (39), we face a problem in our theory.

(30) Taro-ga (dookyuusei-ni) shinsya-o urayamashi-gar-are-ta.
Taro-NOM (classmate-ni) new car-ACC envy-VM-PASS-Past
'Taro is envied by his classmates for his new car.'

The-*ni* marked NP *dookyuusei-ni* carries the role experiencer which is classified with the feature [−r]. Thus, this argument is an internal argument. Then, this status of *dookyuusei-ni* in (30) would force us to expect that it should not be suppressed syntactically due to the same reason why the themes in the embedded a-structures in

(28) and (29) are not suppressed. However, contrary to our expectation, suppression seems to have taken place for this experiencer NP, given the fact that the deletion of this NP does not cause ungrammaticality in the rest of the sentence as we discussed earlier.

There seem to be two ways to explain this problem while taking into account the case for the *-ni* marked instrument NP in the Type C passive construction. First, we could speculate that for native speakers of Japanese, there is a proximity in perception between the agent and the experiencer as is found between the agent and the instrument as we pointed out earlier in this section. In fact, on facing the passive predicate *urayamashi-gar-are-ru* and its active counterpart *urayamashi-gar-u*, we do not just read a fact about a certain human being's feeling towards something. Rather, we picture in mind the situation where a human being is actually expressing her envy for something in terms of an action (a controllable movement of her body) such as saying it in words or using facial expressions. Thus, it might be the case that the *-ni* marked NP in (30) should be analyzed as agent, although we have so far called it an experiencer in this paper. In this way, since the agent is intrinsically classified with [−o] and is an external argument which is subject to syntactic suppression within an embedded a -structure, the optionality of this NP within the passive sentence in (30) is explained.

Second, as we mentioned briefly in section 2. 1, while the [−r] classification is available to all internal arguments, the classification [+o] is limited to the ones which are lower than the goal on the thematic hierarchy in (12) (Alsina (1992)). This reflects the classification of patientlike roles proposed in Alsina and Mchombo (1989) which claims that the optionality to classify the instrument, theme/patient, and locative (i. e. the roles lower than the goal) in terms of the feature [+o] is valid cross-linguistically. Moreover, Bresnan and Moshi (1990) introduce the generalization that the roles to be suppressed are intrinsically specified by the syntactic feature with the minus value, i. e. [−r] or [−o].

The *-ni* marked NP in (30) is an experiencer and is an internal argument. Then, it follows that by virtue of not being placed lower than the goal on the thematic hierarchy, it is only classified with the feature [−r]. Thus, it is qualified for suppression based on Bresnan and Moshi's (1990) generalization, and its optionality within the sentence is expected. Contrary to this, when *kuruma-ni* in (29) is perceived as an instrument, this NP is considered as associated with the feature [+o] in that the instrument role is found lower than the goal on the hierarchy and this classification is

ensured to apply. In addition, this argument cannot be suppressed by virtue of Bresnan and Moshi's (1990) generalization, since it is neither [−r] nor [−o]. In this way, we are able to explain the undeletability of *kuruma-ni* out of the passive sentence (29).

It is obvious for our theory, however, if we take the second solution to our problem above, that we are required to stipulate a condition which prevents an internal argument with the classification [−r] from undergoing suppression. Together with this condition, we might be able to reformulate the a-structure for the Type C and D passives given in (18) and (19) respectively. However, given the current stage where an independent motivation for such a condition is unavailable, we will not go on to refer to the reformulation of the passive a-structures in this paper.

3. Conclusion

In the discussion above, we have presented an analysis of the passive sentences in Japanese within the framework introduced in LMT. Our analysis so far discussed by no means accounts for all and the only occurrences of passive sentences in Japanese (see section 2. 2. and 2. 5.). However, the following three points have been pointed out which will eventually lead us to a further consideration of the passive in Japanese from a semantic point of view.

First, as we mentioned earlier in this paper, passivization in Chicheŵa is not possible when theme is ranked the highest on the hierarchy of thematic roles within an a-structure (Alsina and Mchombo (1989)). Similarly, we have limited the case to which the universal rule of passivization in (15) is applicable in Japanese such that this rule demotes $\hat{\theta}$ when it is ranked higher than theme on the thematic hierarchy.

Bresnan and Kanerva (1992) give a theoretical account for this phenomenon in terms of the Intrinsic Classification (IC) Parameter, which explains the variation in languages as to the number of roles within a predicate which receive the classification [−r] intrinsically. They state that in Chicheŵa (and also in English), the IC Parameter is set at one. In other words, only one role within a single a-structure in Chicheŵa and English is classified with the intrinsic feature [−r]. Thus, in the transitive predicate <th loc>, since both theme and goal are internal arguments, they have the possibility to receive the classification for objects [−r] or [+o]. However, if the theme takes [−r], then by virtue of the IC Parameter, the locative role must be [+

o]. When passivization suppresses the theme, what is left is the locative argument. This argument is unable to be realized as a surface subject after the Default Principle assigns [+r] to it. Since there is no subject, this predicate is considered as ill-formed without meeting the Well-formedness Conditions. In this way, the fact that theme passivizes neither in Chicheŵa nor in English is explained.

We would like to claim, then, that the IC Parameter applies to Japanese in the same way as it does to Chicheŵa and English. In this way, the unpassivizability of theme in Japanese could be explained. If it were the case, then it would be expected that Japanese does not allow double object passivization just like Chicheŵa and English do not. However, in this paper we will not go on to the discussion with regard to this point for our purposes.[9] In any case, the reason for the unpassivizability of theme in Japanese, we would speculate, is deducible from its status as an internal argument.

Second, the theme argument which appears in passive sentences in Japanese seems to be limited to a certain type. As we discussed briefly in an earlier section, only theme which has an ability to control an event or a state described in the predicate in which it occurs can appear marked by *-ni* in Type D passive sentences. Thus, we could posit a contrast between such a kind of theme and the other. However, we by no means consider this contrast to be accurately termed yet, although we believe that it will eventually be a clue for our forthcoming discussion on theme arguments in passive sentences in Japanese (Saiki (in preparation)).

Lastly, our analysis differs from previous analyses which consider the subjects of the Types B, C, and D passive constructions as associated with the role experiencer, and we have classified the same arguments as theme. Moreover, we presented a piece of argument for our analysis in section 2. 3, and hypothesized that the availability of adversative or non-adversative (pure) readings on the part of the subjects in these types of passive sentences could be attributed to a certain characteristic of theme. However, we have not investigated such a characteristic of theme. Furthermore, there still is a question as to what adversative reading in Japanese passive sentences really is. Is the syntax really responsible for its availability within a passive sentence? Or, is it because of some factor outside the grammar that brings forth an adversative reading? There has not been any relevant literature which discusses the availability of adversative reading in Japanese passive sentences from such point of view. Thus, a study which proves or falsifies our hypothesis mentioned above is required and we

believe that such a study will surely contribute to the further clarification of the thematic role theme as well as the controversial availability of adversative reading in the Japanese passive sentences.

Footnotes

*This paper is a revised version of Saiki (1994) and Saiki (1995). The author would like to thank Joan Bresnan, Jane Simpson, and Kazuyuki Yamamoto for their extremely helpful comments on the earlier versions of this paper. She also would like to thank Miriam Green and Mitsuko Hashimoto for their help in the preparation of this paper. Finally, the author would like to mention how much she is honored to see this paper placed in the last issue of *Studies in Humanities*, which has, for so many years, represented part of the work done by the researchers in the College of Liberal Arts at Kanazawa University. Nobody can deny that the achievements of our College within the academia as well as the society have been remarkable and whose loss will be greatly lamented in the future.

1. These NPs usually correspond to *by* phrases (and also to *with* or *at* phrases in some cases) in English passive sentences. However, we avoided giving a translation for the particle *-ni* in the gloss lines of our examples. In addition, although *-ni* can be replaced by semantic markers such as-*kara* and *-yori* 'from', and *-niyotte* 'by' under certain conditions (Inoue (1976), Teramura (1987)), we will not discuss it in this paper and will concentrate instead on the case where *-ni* occurs marking NPs as a default case in Japanese passive sentences. The particle *-ni* exhibits extremely interesting behavior in Japanese in that it is able to mark almost all the thematic roles applied in analyzing languages. For this behavior of *-ni*, see Saiki (in preparation).

2. The abbreviations used throughout the gloss lines in this paper stand for the following terms.

NOM=nominative	TOP=topic	PASS=passive morpheme
ACC=accusative	Pres=present tense	VM=verbalizing morpheme
GEN=genitive	Past=past tense	GM=gerundive morpheme

3. The identification as to the thematic roles with which the *-ni* marked NPs in the

Type C and D passives are associated are subject to change in section 2. 5. In addition, the symbol ≫ in chart (11) is to be read 'other than '.

4. In section 1. 2., we showed the cases where agent, experiencer and instrument occur as a-adjuncts marked with *-ni* in this type of passive. We have not shown the cases where other roles which are assumed on the thematic hierarchy in (12) (i. e. benefactor, goal, patient, and locative) occur in the same place. Nevertheless, we state in (15) that the relevant role must be placed higher than theme on the hierarchy because of the following reasons. First, the syntax of the predicates which are subject to the operation in (15) with benefactor or goal as their $\hat{\theta}$ involves a characteristic which does not seem to be explained in terms of the simple a-structure which is assumed in (15) (Saiki (in preparation)). Second, predicates with patient as their $\hat{\theta}$ seem to be limited to the ones which have already undergone passivization. However, the operation in (15) is not applicable to such a case, since after the suppression of patient, no argument is left behind as a syntactic argument and this a-structure is deemed ill-formed. Lastly, the case in which a locative appears as $\hat{\theta}$ is out of the question, because it is obvious that the suppression of this role brings forth an empty ill-formed a-structure due to the assumption that the locative is the lowest role on the hierarchy of thematic roles.

5. See Saiki (in preparation) for more discussion on subgrouping of theme based on the analyses of the tough construction and sentences with reciprocal predicates besides further attention to the passive in Japanese.

6. Only the passive with theme as its subject exhibits another phenomenon which requires attention. See examples in (i) and (ii).

(i) *Kono hon-wa Taro-ni yom-are-ta.
this book-TOP Taro-ni read-PASS-Past
'This book was read by Taro.'

(ii) Kono hon-wa 1980-nen-dai-ni ookuno jyoseitachi -ni yom-are-ta.
this book-TOP 1980s-year-period-inmany women-ni read-PASS-Pres
'This book was read by so many women in the 1980s.'

Both (i) and (ii) have predicates where the verb *yomu* 'to read' is passivized. Also their subject *kono hon*'this book' is identified as carrying the role theme. However, there is a difference in grammaticality between these two sentences. Though one might attribute the fact that (i) sounds odd to the general constraint in Japanese which avoids inanimate subjects, it is obvious that we cannot refer to this constraint, given the grammatical sentence (ii) with its subject being inanimate.

If we compare the above two sentences, we notice that they differ in the following way : in (i) it is difficult for native speakers to read a reason which causes the subject to be affected, whereas in (ii) such a difficulty is not available and native speakers can easily picture in mind how the subject is affected based on the description in the rest of the sentence. The above, as we speculate, is the intuitive reason to explain the variation in grammaticality illustrated in (i) and (ii) above. As we mentioned, the subject of (ii) is theme, which is the role whose state or location is expressed within a sentence. When it appears as the subject of the passive, the rest of the sentence must contain the semantics which gives plausible reason for the theme to be affected within the description of the state or event concerning the subject. Thus, we consider the notion of affectedness on the part of subjects as a key to explain the grammaticality of the passive with theme subjects. See Saiki (in preparation) for more discussion on theme subjects in the passive.

7. For the theme role in the embedded a-structure in both (27) and (28), [−r] classification could be used alternatively. If this alternative is chosen, due to the Intrinsic Classification Parameter (IC Parameter, Bresnan and Kanerva (1992)) which restricts the number of arguments with the intrinsic classification [−r] to one in Japanese (see section 3 of this paper), the locative argument is identified with the feature [+o] in (28).

8. We used [−r] as the feature for the locative role in (28). Our classification is based on the observation that locative objects in Japanese choose the accusative case marker *-o*, which generally marks objects which are intrinsically classified with this feature in Japanese. However, here we are not excluding the possibility to choose [+o] instead of the above feature.

9. Verbs which are usually considered as having double objects in Japanese take an

argument marked with the accusative *-o* and an argument marked with *-ni* in addition to the subject argument. For example, *oshieru* 'to teach', *hanasu* 'to tell', *miseru* 'to show' are among such verbs, and the theme and the goal arguments are expressed marked by *-o* and *-ni* on the surface. However, this realization of goal is not syntactically ensured given that its occurrence within a sentence is in any case optional. For capturing this characteristic of goal, we could apply a similar kind of analysis as the one presented for the double object construction in English by Alsina and Mchombo (1988) where they consider a benefactor and a goal as applicative arguments.

References

Alsina, A. (1992) "On the Argument Structure of Causatives," *Linguistic Inquiry* 23.4, 517-555.

Alsina, A. and S. A. Mchombo (1988) "Lexical Mapping in the Chicheŵa Applicative Construction," paper presented to the Summer Working Group on Argument Structure and Syntax, CSLI, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Bresnan, J. and J. M. Kanerva (1989) "Locative Inversion in Chicheŵa : A Case Study of Factorization in Grammar," *Linguistic Inquiry* 20. 1, 1-50.

Bresnan, J. and J. M. Kanerva (1992) "The Thematic Hierarchy and Locative Inversion in UG," in T. Stowell and E. Wehrli, eds., *Syntax and the Lexicon. Syntax and Semantics* 26, 111-125, Academic Press, New York.

Bresnan, J. and L. Moshi. (1990) "Object asymmetries in Comparative Bantu Syntax," *Linguistic Inquiry* 21. 2, 147-185.

Bresnan, J. and A. Zaenen (1990) "Deep Unaccusativity in LFG," in K. Dziwirek et al., eds., *Grammatical Relations : A Cross-theoretical Perspective*, 45-57, CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA.

Howard, I., and A. M. Niyekawa-Howard (1976) "Passivization," in M. Shibatani, ed., *Japanese Generative Grammar. Syntax and Semantics* 5, 201-238, Academic Press, New York.

Inoue, K. (1976) *Henkeibunpoo to Nihongo*, Taisyuukan, Tokyo.

Kuno, S. (1983) *Shin Nihonbunpoo Kenkyuu*, Taisyuukan, Tokyo.

Matsumoto, Y. (1990) "On the Syntax of Japanese 'Intransitivizing ' -te aru Construction : An Example of a Non-lexical Predicate, "*CLS* 26, 277-291.

Miyagawa, S. (1989) *Structure and Case Marking in Japanese,Syntax and Semantics 22*,

Academic Press, New York.

Saiki, M. (1994) "What does the Lexical Mapping Theory Tell us about Japanese? (Study 1 : An LFG Analysis of Three Place Predicates in Japanese), " paper read at the 46th annual meeting of the English Literary Society of Japan : The Regional Branch of the Chuubu District, Seika Junior College, Shizuoka.

Saiki, M. (1995) "An Analysis of the Passive in Japanese : Deeper into the Thematic Role Theme," paper read at the 48th annual meeting of the English Literary Society of Japan : The Regional Branch of the Chugoku and Shikoku District, Yamaguchi University, Yamaguchi.

Saiki, M. (in preparation) "A Note on Theme Subjects in Japanese," ms, College of Liberal Arts, Kanazawa University.

Schlesinger, I. M. (1989) "Instruments as Agents: on the Nature of Semantic Relations," *Journal of Linguistics* 25. 1, 189-210.

Song, N. S. (1993) *Thematic Relations and Transitivity in English, Japanese and Korean*, U. of Hawaii Press, Honolulu.

Teramura, H. (1987) *Nihongo-no Sintakusu to Imi* I, the 6th edition, Kuroshio Syuppan, Tokyo.