

Chapter 2 Classification of Japanese passives – Previous analyses

2.1 Introduction

Over the course of the twentieth century, many researchers, such as Yamada (1908: 371-380), Matsushita (1930/1977: 157-161), Mikami (1953/1972: 98-112), Kuno (1973: 22-24), Shibatani (1978: 133-142), Teramura (1982: 214-217), Nitta (1991: 31-35) and Masuoka (2000: 55-68), have attempted to classify Japanese passives into several basic types. We will go over their views, dividing them into three main groups: earlier approaches, the mainstream approach and more recent approaches, following the chronological development of ideas. Among earlier approaches, first, we will examine Yamada's view. Although he did not actually try to categorise Japanese passives, his work is a good starting point for comparison with later studies. We will then introduce Matsushita's analysis as the major work in this early period. Matsushita divides Japanese passives into two groups, the passive of interest and the plain passive, according to their semantic features. Following these early approaches comes what we refer to as the mainstream approach. Scholars such as Mikami, Kuno, Shibatani, and Teramura, who adopt this approach, apply a syntactic dichotomy in analysing Japanese passives, resulting in their classification of direct and indirect. This syntactic approach is still the one most commonly used. In a more recent approach, however, Masuoka seems to go back in time to something similar to Matsushita's early semantic analysis. We will see, however, how

Masuoka's approach has improved and polished Matsushita's original analysis. Lastly, Nitta's recent analysis is considered, especially with respect to the treatment of possessor passives.

2.2 Earlier approaches

2.2.1 Yamada's approach

Yamada Yoshio, one of the first researchers to adopt a scholarly approach to the study of language in Japan, contributed to making modern Japanese grammar an academic field. However, in terms of the study of Japanese passive constructions, his focus was on describing the differences between Japanese passives and those in English and German. For instance, Yamada observes that in Japanese, unlike in English, there are passive sentences involving not only transitive verbs but also intransitive verbs. However, he does not go on to explain the difference between the passive of a transitive verb and that of an intransitive verb in Japanese.

Yamada also states that the Japanese passive is restricted to cases in which the subject is a sentient NP, that is one that can be thought of as having consciousness. He gives the following, unacceptable example. (Yamada 1908: 373)

(1) *Kano hasi wa waga yuuzin ni **tukur-are-tari**.

That bridge TOP my friend by build-PASS-PAST

‘That bridge **was made** by my friend.’

Although the sentence above is unacceptable, if the agent marker *ni* were replaced by *ni-yotte*, as in example (2) below, the sentence would be grammatical. This is the type of passive that Matsushita (1930) recognises as the ‘plain passive’ or so-called ‘*ni-yotte* passive’.

(2) Kano hasi wa waga yuuzin ni-yotte **tukur-are-tari**.

That bridge TOP my friend by build-PASS-PAST

‘That bridge **was made** by my friend.’

This kind of passive is said not to be inherent to the Japanese language, but to have developed fairly recently under influence from the translation of Western languages. Kinsui (1997: 762) claims that *ni-yotte* was not used to mark the agent in a passive sentence until the word-for-word translation of Dutch grammar appeared in the late 19th century. We can, thus, speculate that in Yamada’s days, around 1908, *ni-yotte* was not yet widely accepted as an agent marker in a passive sentence, as it was by Matsushita’s time, around 1930. We will discuss this matter further in relation to Matsushita’s analysis in the next section.

2.2.2 Matsushita's analysis

Matsushita Daizaburo's work is said to be one of the first major comprehensive studies of passive constructions in modern Japanese. Matsushita (1930 / 1977: 157-161) classifies Japanese passives, firstly, into two groups - 'A. Plain / simple passive' and 'B. Passive of interest' - according to their semantic features. He then subdivides B, passive of interest, into four groups. Matsushita's classification is summarised in the following table:

Table 1: Matsushita's classification

A. Plain passive
B. Passive of interest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. one in which the subject itself is affected by the action (self passive) ii. one in which possessions/relations of the subject are affected by the action (possessor passive) iii. one in which the subject is affected by the action of his/her possessions/relations (possessor self passive) iv. one in which the subject is affected by the action of a third party (third party passive)

Matsushita describes each group as follows:

A. Plain / simple passive: is one that does not have a special meaning of affectedness at all. This type is not inherent to the Japanese language.

(3) Ie goto.ni kadomatu ga **tate-rare-ta.**

House each decorative.pine.trees NOM set.up-PASS-PAST

‘New Year’s gate decoration pines **were put up** in front of every house.’

(4) Ziti seido ga sik-are kokkai ga **syoosyuu-s-are-ta.**

Autonomy system NOM place-PASS the.Diet NOM call-PASS-PAST

‘A system of self-government **was promulgated**, and the Diet was assembled.’

Matsushita (1930 / 1977) claims that the plain passive ‘is not inherent to the Japanese language’, and ‘it is used in a spoken sentence only when it is derived from a written sentence which has the style of a literal translation of a Western language’. However, Masuoka (1987) and other more recent researchers claim that, among the passives with an inanimate subject (in Matsushita’s words ‘plain passive’), there actually is a type that is inherent to the Japanese language. I will discuss this in relation to Masuoka’s analysis (1987, 2000) in Section 2.4.1.

B. Passive of interest: is one in which the subject is treated as an individual and is affected adversely or beneficially by the action of somebody or something else. Matsushita identifies the following four subgroups in this type of passive (Matsushita 1930: 159; his examples):

i) one in which the subject itself is affected by the action (self passive)

(5) Kodomo ga inu ni **kam-are-ru**. (transitive)

Child NOM dog by bite-PASS-PRES

‘A child **is bitten** by a dog.’

(6) Kodomo ga inu ni **tobituk-are-ru**. (intransitive¹)

Child NOM dog by jump.at-PAST-PRES

‘A child **is affected** by a dog’s **jumping** (at him).’

ii) one in which possessions/relations of the subject are affected by the action (possessor passive)

(7) Busi ga teki ni katana o **otos-are-ru**. (transitive)

Samurai NOM enemy by sword ACC drop-PASS-PRES

‘A samurai **is affected** by **having** his sword **slashed** out of his hand by his enemy.’

(8) Busi ga teki ni temoto e **tobikom-are-ru**². (intransitive)

Samurai NOM enemy by hand at jump.in-PASS-PRES

‘A samurai **is affected** by his enemy’s **jumping** right in front of him.’

¹ Although according to the definition of transitive and intransitive verbs in this study the verb *tobituku* ‘jump at’ would be categorised as transitive, Matsushita identifies it as intransitive.

² This example does not seem to illustrate Matsushita’s point well. I assume that, by giving this example, Matsushita means that the samurai’s “personal safety” is affected by the action. If one’s opponent is too close, it is difficult to use one’s sword, so presumably in that way the samurai is adversely affected.

iii) one in which the subject is affected by the action of his/her possessions/relations (possessor self passive)

(9) Teisyu ga nyooobo ni syaku o **okos-are-ru.** (transitive)

Husband NOM wife by temper ACC have-PASS-PRES

‘A husband **is affected** by his wife’s **losing** her temper.’

(10) Teisyu ga nyooobo ni sina-re-ru. (intransitive)

Husband NOM wife by die-PASS-PRES

‘A husband is affected by his wife’s dying (on him).’

iv) one in which the subject is affected by the action of a third party (third party passive)

(11) Tanin ni na o **nas-are-ru.** (transitive)

Stranger by name ACC make-PASS-PRES

‘One **is affected** by another’s **making** a name (for himself).’

(12) Tanin ni **seikoos-are-ru.** (intransitive)

Stranger by succeed-PASS-PRES

‘One **is affected** by another’s **succeeding.**’

Matsushita states that all passives with an animate or personified inanimate subject, in his words passives of interest, have the meaning of adversative or beneficial effect. This view is still basically shared by some current researchers, such as Masuoka (1987) and Song (1993). However, Shibatani (2000: 175) counters that it is possible to describe an event from a neutral point of view in a passive with an animate subject, and he

gives the following example (Shibatani 2000: 176):

(13) Kodomo ga inu ni **kam-are-ta** no o mi-te wareware wa issei.ni
 Child NOM dog by bite-PASS-PAST NML ACC see-CONJ we TOP all.at.once
 tobidasi-ta.
 rush.out-PAST

‘We saw that a child **was bitten** by a dog, and rushed out all at once.’

Example (13) is a variation of Matsushita’s example (5), an example of type (i) of the passive of interest (those in which the subject itself is affected by the action – ‘self passive’). It is cited again below.

(5) Kodomo ga inu ni **kam-are-ru**. (transitive)

Child NOM dog by bite-PASS-PRES

‘A child **is bitten** by a dog.’

Example (13) includes example (5) in a subordinate clause in the past tense. Shibatani claims that example (13) does not have the same kind of adversative reading as Matsushita’s examples of type (iv) of the passive of interest do (those in which the subject is affected by the action of a third party), as in example (11), cited again below.

(11) Tanin ni na o **nas-are**-ru. (transitive)

Stranger by name ACC make-PASS-PRES

‘One **is affected** by another’s **making** a name (for himself).’

Shibatani (2000) states that if one can detect some adversative meaning in example (13), it would merely come from the lexical meaning of the verb *kamu* ‘to bite’, and it is essentially different from the one that is recognised in type (iv) of the passive of interest. This is a very important issue. We will examine this matter in more detail in Section 5.1.5.

2.3 The mainstream approach - dichotomy of direct passive and indirect passive

Studying Matsushita’s analysis, later researchers, like Mikami (1953/1972: 98-112), Kuno (1973: 24), Shibatani (1978: 133-142) and Teramura (1982: 214-217), notice that there are some major syntactic and semantic differences between type one of Matsushita’s passive of interest - ‘i. one in which the subject itself is affected by the action / self passive’ - and all of the other three types:

‘ii. one in which possessions/relations of the subject are affected by the action’,

‘iii. one in which the subject is affected by the action of his/her possessions/relations’ and

‘iv. one in which the subject is affected by the action of the third party’.

This leads them to attempt to reclassify Japanese passives, again into two basic groups, but with a significant difference from Matsushita’s classification. These scholars take

Matsushita's type (i) together with his 'plain passive' in one group and his 'passive of interest' types - (ii), (iii) and (iv) - in the other. This approach is currently the one most commonly used. Although the researchers mentioned above all apply different names to the two groups of passive, the basic stance of their analyses is very similar. We will examine Teramura's analysis here.

Teramura (1982: 214-217) calls the two groups of Japanese passive 'direct passive' and 'indirect passive'. The direct passive corresponds to Matsushita's plain passive and type (i) of the passive of interest (i. one in which the subject itself is affected by the action). The relationship between Matsushita's and Teramura's classifications is shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Relation between Matsushita's and Teramura's classifications

Matsushita's classification	Teramura's classification
A. Plain passive	Direct passive
B. Passive of interest i. self passive ii. possessor passive iii. possessor self passive iv. third party passive	
	Indirect passive

Teramura defines the direct passive as one that has a corresponding active sentence, and in which the subject is affected by the act directly, as in example (14) below (Teramura 1982: 214; his example):

(14) Naotaka wa sobo ni **sodate-rare-ta**.

Naotaka TOP grandmother by bring-up-PASS-PAST

'Naotaka **was brought up** by his grandmother.'

Example (14) satisfies both of Teramura's criteria for a direct passive. Firstly, it has a corresponding active sentence, given as (15) below:

(15) Sobo ga Naotaka o sodate-ta

grandmother NOM Naotaka ACC bring-up-PAST

'(His) grandmother brought Naotaka up.'

Example (14) also satisfies Teramura's criterion that a direct passive has a subject that is affected directly by the act described. In Example (14), Naotaka is the Undergoer³ of the action; he is directly affected by *sobo*'s ('his grandmother's') action, *sodateru* 'to bring up'.

³ As explained in 1.6.2, I use the term 'Undergoer' here as introduced in Foley and Van Valin (1984). In contrast to the notion 'Actor', 'Undergoer' is characterised 'as the argument which expresses the [core] participant which does not perform, initiate, or control any situation but rather is affected by it in some way'. (Foley and Van Valin 1984: 29)

On the other hand, Teramura claims that an indirect passive is one that does not have an active counterpart, and the subject is affected by the event described by the verb only indirectly, as in example (16) below (Teramura 1982: 214; his example):

(16) Naotaka wa go-sai no toki hubo ni **sin-are-ta**.

Naotaka TOP five years old GEN time parents by die-PASS-PAST

'Naotaka **was adversely affected** by his parents **dying** when he was five.'

Teramura claims that example (16) satisfies his first criterion for an indirect passive, in that it does not have an active counterpart. However, it must be acknowledged that example (17) below could be thought of as an active counterpart of example (16).

(17) Naotaka ga go-sai no toki, hubo ga sin-da.

Naotaka NOM five years old GEN when parents NOM die-PAST

'Naotaka's parents died when he was five.'

However, note that Naotaka does not appear in the main clause, *hubo ga sin-da* 'his parents died' in example (17). It thus can be said that example (16) satisfies Teramura's first criterion in the sense that it does not have an active counterpart that has Naotaka in the main clause. However, one could also suggest (18) as an active counterpart for example (16).

- (18) Naotaka ga go-sai no toki, Naotaka no hubo ga sin-da.
 Naotaka NOM five years old GEN when Naotaka GEN parentsNOM die-PAST
 ‘Naotaka’s parents died when he was five.’

In (18), Naotaka appears in the main clause, in this case, as the possessor NP. In order to eliminate (18) as an active counterpart for (16), we need to clarify Teramura’s first criterion for indirect passive as follows: an indirect passive is one that does not have an active counterpart in which the NP denoting the subject of the passive appears as a core argument. Now we can say that example (16) satisfies the first criterion for an indirect passive.

Example (16) also satisfies Teramura’s second criterion for indirect passive, in that the subject, Naotaka, is not an Undergoer of the event, the death of his *hubo* ‘parents’. Naotaka is still affected by the event, but not directly. I agree with Teramura’s analysis to this extent.

Teramura (1982: 215), also, claims that the indirect passive generally implies that the subject is adversely affected by the event, and therefore, he also calls it the ‘adversative passive’. Many previous researchers, such as Mikami (1953 / 1972: 98-112), Kuno (1973: 24) and Shibatani (1978), have held the same view. Kuno (1973: 24), for example, distinguishes the syntactic subgroups, ‘direct passive’ and ‘indirect passive’, and the semantic subgroups, ‘neutral passive’ and ‘adversative passive’. He then states that the correlation between the syntactic distinction and the semantic distinction - more

specifically the correspondence between the indirect passive and the adversative passive on the one hand, and that between the direct passive and the neutral passive on the other - occurs due to their different derivation processes. Although Kuno later retracts this claim (Kuno 1982), it has been a very influential view in the field of the study of Japanese passives. For this reason I will investigate the derivation processes that have been proposed for Japanese passives in the next section.

2.3.1 Generative transformational grammarian's approach to the dichotomy of direct and indirect passives

In the framework of generative transformational grammar, there are two analyses proposed to account for the derivation process of the direct passive and the indirect passive. Some researchers, like McCawley (1972), Kuno (1973) and Shibatani (1978), claim that the direct passive and the indirect passive have different types of underlying structure and that the two types of passive need to be distinguished on this basis. Other researchers, like Kuroda (1965) and Howard and Niyekawa-Howard (1976), argue that all Japanese passives can be derived in the same way, and should be syntactically treated uniformly. The former is called the 'non-uniform theory' and the latter is called the 'uniform theory'.

Both the uniform theory and the non-uniform theory agree on the derivational process of the indirect passive. According to both analyses, an indirect passive, such as

example (19), is derived from an underlying structure that involves two sentences, as in (20).

(19) Watasi wa Butyoo ni kinoo no hanasi o **kik-are-ta**.

I TOP division chief by yesterday GEN story ACC hear-PASS-PAST

‘I was adversely affected by the division chief’s hearing yesterday’s story.’

(20) [Watasi wa [Butyoo ga kinoo no hanasi o kik] are ta]

The suffix *-(r)are* functions as a main clause predicate, and the extra noun phrase (always the subject / topic of the passive), in this case *watasi* ‘I’, is considered to be the subject / topic of the main clause. This main clause takes an embedded sentential complement, *Butyoo ga kinoo no hanasi o kik(u)* ‘the division chief hears the story’. To convert (20) to (19), it is necessary to apply the Agentive-Ni Attachment rule (Kuno 1982: 193) to the subject of the embedded clause, *butyoo* ‘the division chief’, and the Verb Raising rule (Kuno 1982: 193) to the verb of the embedded clause.

However, the uniform theory and the non-uniform theory take different approaches in accounting for the derivation process of the direct passive. According to the uniform theory, a direct passive, such as example (21) below, can be derived from the underlying source (22) below, in the same way as an indirect passive.

(21) Hitosi ga Keiko ni **nagur-are-ta**.

Hitoshi NOM Keiko by hit-PASS-PAST

‘Hitoshi **was hit** by Keiko.’

(22) [Hitosi ga [Keiko ga Hitosi o nagur] rare-ta.]

There is only one difference between the structures in (20) and (22). That is, in the structure in (22) the main subject / topic, Hitoshi, is identical to the object of the embedded clause, Hitoshi. To generate sentence (21), this object must be deleted at some point in the derivation process.

On the other hand, proponents of the non-uniform theory apply a permutation transformation, which Kuno (1973: 345) refers to as ‘pure passive formation’, to a simplex underlying structure as in (23).

(23) Keiko ga Hitosi o nagut-ta.

Keiko NOM Hitoshi ACC hit-PAST

‘Keiko hit Hitoshi.’

Thus Kuno (1973), Shibatani (1978) and many other proponents of the non-uniform theory claim that the direct passive and the indirect passive need to be treated separately. One of the main reasons for their claim is that they believe that it is because the indirect passive

and the direct passive are derived differently that they therefore function differently. The indirect passives, they say, are semantically adversative passives, whereas the direct passives are neutral passives. Kuno (1973) mentions that a direct passive is derived from a simplex underlying structure by applying the simple passivisation rule. The suffix *-(r)are* of a direct passive is a transparent grammatical form, and, therefore, it does not have an adversative meaning. The adversative meaning only accompanies the suffix *-(r)are* in the complex underlying structure from which indirect passives are derived.

More recently, Hoshi (1999) has re-examined the uniform versus non-uniform hypotheses. Although he supports the uniform hypothesis with regard to the relationship between the *ni* direct passive and the *ni yotte* passive, Hoshi agrees with the non-uniform hypothesis, in relation to the relationship between the *ni* direct passive and the *ni* indirect passive in particular. Hoshi (1999: 195) claims that we have to recognise that the *ni* direct passive and the *ni* indirect passive are different from one another in an important respect. He presents the evidence of the antecedent of *zibun* ‘self’, which was originally suggested by N. A. McCawley (1972) and Kuno (1973) separately. Consider the following examples from N. A. McCawley (1972) and Kuno (1972: 299, 304), which Hoshi gives:

(24) a. John_i-ga Mary_j-ni zibun_{i/*j}-no uti-de koros-are-ta.

John-NOM Mary-by self-GEN house-in kill-PASS-PAST

‘John_i was affected by Mary_j’s killing him in self_{i/*j}’s house.’

- b. John_i-ga Mary_j-ni zibun_{i/j}-no koto-o zimans-are-ta.
 John-NOM Mary-by self-GEN matter-ACC boast-PASS-PAST
 ‘John_i was affected by Mary_j’s bragging about self_{i/j}.’

In example (24a), an example of the direct passive, John can be the antecedent of an anaphor, *zibun* ‘self’, but Mary cannot. In the case of example (24b), an example of the indirect passive, however, *zibun* can take either John or Mary as its antecedent. It is clear that the direct passive and the indirect passive behave differently in this respect.

There is a problem, however, with the non-uniform theory in its assumption of a correspondence between the direct passive and the neutral passive: the assumption that all the direct passives have neutral meaning. This problem arises because there are a considerable proportion of sentences that would clearly qualify as direct passives, according to the definition given above, and yet have an adversative meaning. Look at example (25) below.

- (25) a. John ga Mary o mi-ta.
 John NOM Mary ACC see-PAST
 ‘John saw Mary.’
- b. Mary ga John ni **mi-rare**-ta.
 Mary NOM John by see-PASS-PAST
 ‘Mary **was seen** by John.’

Example (25b) is a direct passive according to the criterion that there is an active counterpart ((25a). However, all native speakers would agree that this sentence is interpreted as having an adversative meaning. This is actually one of the main reasons why Kuno later withdraws from the non-uniform theory and adopts the uniform theory (Kuno (1982: 196)). We will consider this matter in Section 4.3 below in connection with the special emotive reading associated with some Japanese passives.

2.4 More recent approaches

2.4.1 Masuoka's approach

Masuoka (1987, 2000⁴: 55-68) classifies Japanese passives, firstly, into three semantic groups: A. Demotional passive; B. Attribute-describing passive; and C. Affected passive. He, then, subdivides C, Affected passive, into two groups: direct passive and indirect passive. The main change from previous analyses is that his analysis is based on the concept that there are several types of description. According to Masuoka (2000: 39), there are two basic description types: 'attribute description' and 'event description'. Attribute description, on the one hand, is for expressing that an entity exhibits certain features or

⁴ Although Masuoka first presented this analysis in Masuoka (1987) and then in Masuoka (1991), I will quote from the most recently revised version, Masuoka (2000).

characteristics. Event description, on the other hand, is for denoting events that occur at a specific time and place. The attribute-describing passive is a type of ‘attribute description’, and the demotional passive and the affected passive are kinds of ‘event description’. As a result, Masuoka’s analysis of Japanese passives is similar to Matsushita’s (1930 / 1977: 157-161), described earlier in Section 2.2.2. Masuoka’s affected passive basically corresponds to Matsushita’s ‘passive of interest’, and his demotional passive corresponds to Matsushita’s ‘plain passive’. The significant point here is that, in his analysis, Masuoka recognises another type, the attribute-describing passive, which can be categorised as a part of Matsushita’s plain passive. Consequently, the plain passive includes not only the type of passive not inherent to the Japanese language, the demotional passive, but also the one inherent to Japanese, the attribute-describing passive.

This study acknowledges that the classification of Japanese passive constructions is a very complex issue, and one of its aims is to clarify this classification. In order to help making things as clear as possible at this stage of the discussion, the following table shows the relation between Matsushita’s distinction and Masuoka’s classification. For the purpose of comparison, Teramura’s classification is also included, to represent the mainstream approach.

Table 3: Relation between Matsushita’s, Masuoka’s and Teramura’s classifications

Matsushita’s classification	Masuoka’s classification	Teramura’s classification
A. Plain passive	A. Demotional passive (<i>Ni-yotte</i> passive)	Direct passive
	B. Attribute describing P	
	C. Affected passive ii. direct passive (includes some non-sentient passives with a latent affectee)	
B. Passive of interest i. self passive ii. possessor passive iii. possessor self passive iv. third party passive	i. indirect passive (does not include possessor passives)	Indirect passive (includes possessor passives)

Masuoka claims that ‘A. Demotional passive’, the so-called ‘*ni-yotte*’ passive⁵, is a type of event-describing passive. Its main purpose is to background the ‘agent’. This type of passive is generally a non-sentient passive⁶ – one that has a non-sentient subject. Many of the demotional passives are expressed as topicless sentences, in which the subject is marked simply by the nominative particle *ga*⁷. This is because the demotional passive

⁵ This is the one that does not occur traditionally in Japanese. See Section 3.2.1.1.

⁶ Passives with an inanimate subject are called *hizyoo no ukemi* ‘non-sentient passive’ by Japanese linguists.

⁷ Very often this kind of sentence with particle *ga* is interpreted as an objective description, as opposed to a sentence where the subject is selected as a topic and therefore expresses the situation from a certain perspective.

usually describes an objectively observed fact, as it is, without representing somebody's subjective view. Examples follow (Masuoka 2000: 64; his examples):

(26) Onazi hizuke de hakubutukan syomu kitei ga **kaiteis-are** atarasiku

Same date on Museum general.affairs regulation NOM revise-PASS newly

gizyutuin seido ga **mooke-rare-ta.**

technologist system NOM set.up-PASS-PAST

‘On the same date, the regulations concerning the general affairs of the museum **were revised**, and a group of technologists **was set up** for the first time.’

(27) Masako no me no mae.ni itirin no akai bara ga **sasidas-are-ta.**

Masako GEN eye GEN in.front single GEN red rose NOM thrust-PASS-PAST

‘A red rose **was thrust** under Masako’s very nose.’

However, Masuoka also states that there still are some demotional passives where the subject is topicalised by the topic particle *wa*. Following are examples (Masuoka 2000: 65; his examples):

(28) Umi wa nannen.ka mae.ni sukkari **umetate-rare**, ...

Sea TOP some.years before completely reclaim-PASS

‘The sea **was completely filled in** several years ago, and ...’

(29) Sumoo wa Kennin-zi no keidai no akiti de **okonaw-are-ta**.

Sumo TOP Kennin.Temple GEN precinct GEN open.space at hold-PASS-PAST

‘Sumo matches **were held** in an open space in the precincts of the Kennin Temple.’

As mentioned above, Masuoka states that, in a demotional passive sentence, the ‘agent’ is backgrounded: in many cases, it does not appear in the sentence at all. If it is necessary to state the agent, it is indicated as a *ni-yotte*-NP, not as a *ni*-NP as in an affected passive. This is illustrated in examples (30) and (31) below (Masuoka 2000: 67; his examples):

(30) Sitai wa sarani keisatui ni-yotte syoosai.ni **sirabe-rare-ta**.

Body TOP again police by in.detail investigate-PASS-PAST

‘The corpse **was examined** thoroughly by a police doctor.’

(31) Sore ga Mizuta-hakase ni-yotte **mitome-rare-ta**.

That NOM Dr.Mizuta by approve-PASS-PAST

‘That **was approved** by Dr Mizuta.’

It is for this reason that this type of passive is widely called the ‘*ni-yotte* passive’.

Masuoka (2000: 56) recognises a second type of non-sentient passive: ‘B. Attribute-describing passive’. He defines the attribute-describing passive as one in which an entity, the referent of the subject, is described as possessing certain attributes, as in

examples (32) to (35) below (Masuoka 2000: 56; his examples):

(32) Kono bun wa zyudoobun ni **hukum-are-ru**.

This sentence TOP passive.sentence in include-PASS-PRES

‘This sentence **is categorised** as a passive sentence.’

(33) (Sono suyaki wa) ima made haniwa no issyu da to

(that unglazed.pottery TOP) now until Haniwa GEN one.kind COP QUOT

mi-rare-te i-te, ...

see-PASS-CONJ be-CONJ

‘(This unglazed pottery) has **been seen** as a kind of a Haniwa (clay image), and ...’

(34) Kono maturi wa maitosi siti-gatu ni **okonaw-are-ru**.

This festival TOP every.year July in hold-PASS-PRES

‘This festival **is held** in July every year.’

(35) “Karei-naru itizoku” wa ooku no tyuugoku zinmin ni **yom-are-te**

“The.Great.Family” TOP many GEN Chinese people by read-PASS-CONJ

i-mas-u.

be-POL-PRES

‘“The Great Family” has **been read** by many Chinese people.’

This type is generally a non-sentient passive, with a non-sentient subject. It does not depict the occurrence or existence of an event at a specific time and place. Sentences of this type do occur historically in Japanese, as in example (36) below (cited in Okutsu 1992: 10):

(36) Mukasi koso Naniwa inaka to **if-are-keme** ima miyako hiki
 Long.ago EMPH Naniwa little.town QUOT call-PASS-PAST now capital moved
 miyakobini-keri. [Manyoshu: No. 312]
 looks.like.capital-PAST

‘Long ago, Naniwa **was called** a little town, but now the capital has been moved and it
 looks like a real capital.’

In example (36), the subject, *Naniwa*, is non-sentient, and the rest of the sentence describes an attribute of the subject: it is called a little town. It was partly because of ignorance of this fact that they were not recognised earlier by Matsushita (1930 / 1977).

Masuoka defines the third type, ‘C. Affected passive’, as one that describes a situation in which the subject is somehow affected by the event. According to Masuoka’s classification, if a passive is not classified as either a demotional passive or an attribute-describing passive, it should be classified as an affected passive. Almost all the passives with a sentient subject, therefore, belong to this group.

Masuoka calls the first subtype of the affected passive ‘direct passive’, which has a corresponding active sentence. Masuoka’s direct passive is not as broad as Teramura’s direct passive. Masuoka’s direct passive does not include the attribute-describing passive and demotional passive because they generally have a non-sentient subject, as opposed to

his other categories, which usually have sentient subjects. Teramura groups all of these together precisely because they all have an active counterpart. (See Table 3 above for a comparison of Masuoka's and Teramura's classification.)

All of these passives involve a transitive verb. (Refer to Section 1.6.1.1 for the definition of transitive verbs.) The following three examples of Masuoka's direct passive all have corresponding active sentences with an object marked by the accusative particle *o*.

(37) a. Ano hito ga watasi o mi-te i-ta no ka.

That person NOM I ACC see-CONJ be-PAST NML Q

‘(Oh no), that person was watching me.’

b. Ano hito ni **mi-rare-te** i-ta no ka.

That person by see-PASS-CONJ be-PAST NML Q

‘(Oh no), I was **being watched** by that person.’

(38) a. Kuukai ga Ato Taisoku o tasikani higos-ita.

Kukai NOM Ato Taisoku ACC definitely protect-PAST

‘Kukai definitely protected Ato Taisoku.’

b. Ato Taisoku wa tasikani Kuukai ni **higo-s-are-ta**.

Ato Taisoku TOP definitely Kukai by protect-PASS-PAST

‘Ato Taisoku **was** definitely **protected** by Kukai.’

(39) a. Ie no kagi o mot-te hait-te ki-ta sinseki no obasan

House GEN key ACC have-CONJ enter-CONJ come-PAST relative GEN aunt

ga watasi o hakkens-ita.

NOM I ACC find-PAST

‘My aunt, who got in with the house key she had, found me.’

- b. Watasi wa ie no kagi o mot-te hait-te ki-ta sinseki no
I TOP House GEN key ACC have-CONJ enter-CONJ come-PAST relative GEN
obasan ni **hakken-s-are**-ta.

aunt by find-PASS-PAST

‘I **was found** by my aunt, who got in with the house key she had.’

The corresponding active sentence is not necessarily a cardinal transitive sentence with the object marked by the accusative particle *o*. Sometimes the object is marked by the dative particle *ni*. Examples that have an object marked by particle *ni* in the corresponding active sentence are as follows:

- (40) a. Tanaka Syooni to.yuu mono ga Kuukai ni irais-i...

Tanaka Shoni called person NOM Kukai DAT ask-CONJ

‘A person called Tanaka Shoni asked Kukai, and...’

- b. Kuukai wa Tanaka Syooni to.yuu mono ni **irais-are**...

Kukai TOP Tanaka Shoni called person by ask-PASS

‘Kukai **was asked** by a person called Tanaka Shoni, and...’

- (41) a. Oisya-sama ga watasi ni Hokuriku no onsen ga yoi to

Doctor NOM I DAT Hokuriku GEN hot.spring NOM good QUOT

susume-mas-ita node, ...

advise-POL-PAST because

‘The doctor advised me that a hot spring in Hokuriku was good (for me), so...’

b. Oisya-sama ni Hokuriku no onsen ga yoi to **susume-rare**-mas-ita

Doctor by Hokuriku GEN hot.spring NOM good QUOT advise-PASS-POL-PAST

node, ...

because

‘I **was advised** by the doctor that a hot spring in Hokuriku was good (for me),

so...’

According to Masuoka’s classification, the direct passive also includes the so-called possessor passives, which are given as examples (42) and (43) below (Masuoka 2000: 59; his examples):

(42) Hukoona.koto.ni syoodan ga kinzyo ni rakkas-i tatimati

Unfortunately incendiary.bomb NOM neighbor in fall-CONJ instantly

ie o **yak-are**-ta.

house ACC burn-PASS-PAST

‘Unfortunately, a firebomb fell in the neighborhood, and, in an instant, I **had** my

house **burnt down**.’

(43) Kono hito ni te o **hik-are**-te watasi wa Kyooto no teradera o

This person by hand ACC lead-PASS-CONJI TOP Kyoto GEN temples ACC

megut-ta.

tour-PAST

‘**Being led** by the hand by this person, I had a tour of the temples of Kyoto.’

Masuoka (2000: 59) defines the possessor passive as one that expresses the situation in which possessions of the subject (including related people) undergo the action denoted by the verb, and as a result, the possessor (the subject) is affected. In example (42), the house underwent the action of burning, and the possessor of the house, I, was affected by the situation. In example (43), *te* ‘hand’ underwent the action of leading, and as a result, the possessor of the hand, I, was affected. As mentioned above, Masuoka characterizes this possessor passive as one type of direct passive. This is different from the view of many other researchers. I will examine this issue in relation to Nitta’s analysis in the next section.

The fundamental difference between Masuoka’s categorisation of direct passives and that of Teramura is that Masuoka’s direct passives mostly have sentient subjects. This is because Teramura has no problem with direct passives having non-sentient subjects. In spite of that fact, then, Masuoka does concede that there are some that he would classify as direct passives that have a non-sentient subject. The following are the examples he gives:

(44) Ano e ga kodomo ni **hikisak-are**-ta.

That picture NOM child by tear-PASS-PAST

‘That picture **was torn** by a child.’

(45) Taisetuna okane ga doroboo ni **nusum-are-ta**.

Important money NOM thief by steal-PASS-PAST

‘Important money **was stolen** by a thief.’

Masuoka states that this kind of passive is acceptable only when one can assume a latent affectee. A latent affectee is a sentient party that does not appear in the passive sentence, but is affected by the event in some way. For example, in sentence (44), we can assume a latent party, such as the owner of the picture, who was affected by the child’s tearing the picture. In the case of example (45), it would be the possessor of the money who was affected. This type of passive differs from the possessor passive in that the owner or the possessor does not occur in the sentence and remains latent. In the possessor passive, on the other hand, as in examples (42) and (43), the possessor appears in the sentence as the subject. In example (42), the owner of the house (I), although elided in the sentence, is the subject of the passive clause. In example (43), the possessor of the hand (I), also elided in the sentence, appears as the subject. We will discuss this matter in more detail in Section 3.1.3.

Masuoka’s second subtype of the affected passive is called the ‘indirect passive’. Masuoka’s indirect passive basically corresponds to Teramura’s. Masuoka defines it as one that describes a situation in which the subject is affected by an event in which s/he does not take part, as in examples (46) and (47) below:

(46) (Watasi wa) kare ni **nige-rare-ru** to komar-u node, ...

(I TOP) he by run.away-PASS-PRES if be.in.trouble-PRES because

‘I’d be in trouble if he (goes and) **runs away** (on me), so ...’

(47) Sono tame ukauka.to **sin-are-te** simai-mas-ita.

That because carelessly die-PASS-CONJ complete-POL-PAST

‘Because of that I was off my guard and (he) (went and) **died** on me.’

In example (46), the subject, I, would be affected by the event, his running away, even though ‘I’ is not involved in the event. In the case of example (47), also, the subject, I, was affected by the event of his dying, again an event in which ‘I’ was not directly involved.

As mentioned above, Masuoka defines the affected passive as one that describes a situation in which the subject is affected by an event *in some way*. He also states that the relationship between the subject and the event can be direct or indirect. In the direct passive, as in example (38) above, the subject (Ato Taisoku) bears a direct relation to the event (‘Kukai’s protecting Ato Taisoku’). Compared to this, in the possessor passive, as in example (42), the relationship between the subject (‘I’ (elided in the sentence)) and the event (‘having my house burnt’) is more indirect. Furthermore, in the indirect passive, as in example (46), the involvement of the subject (*watasi* ‘I’) in the event (someone else’s running away) is extremely indirect. In the end, it is apparent that Masuoka views the degree of the subject’s affectedness as a continuum, with the possessor passive in the middle of this continuum. This is the main reason why he puts direct passive, possessor

passive and indirect passive all together under the same heading of affected passive.

2.4.2 Nitta's approach

Nitta (1991: 31) classifies Japanese passives into three groups: normal passive, possessor passive and third party passive. Basically, Nitta's normal passive corresponds to Teramura's direct passive, Nitta's Third Party passive to Teramura's indirect passive, and Nitta's possessor passive to Masuoka's possessor passive. Nitta states that the normal passive should be placed on one end, the third party passive on the other, and the possessor passive should be positioned in the middle.

A significant point in Nitta's analysis is that he sets up the possessor passive group as an independent group. Teramura (1982: 244-245), on the one hand, categorizes the possessor passive, along with the third party passive, as a type of indirect passive. He suggests that this is because, given that the following construction is considered to be an indirect passive, it is usually the case that 'Z is X's something' (Teramura 1982: 245):

(48) X ga Y ni Z o ~rare-ru.

X NOM Y GEN Z ACC -PASS-PRES

'X is affected by Y's doing something to Z.'

‘Z’ could be X’s body part, relative, possessions, or occupied space, in other words, something that has some relation to X. Teramura also states that the possessor passive has an adversative reading, and the degree of adversity depends on the nature of Z, decreasing in the order given above: body part → occupied space.

Masuoka (2000), on the other hand, regards the possessor passive as a type of direct passive, as briefly mentioned in the previous section. He claims that this is because, unlike indirect passives, whether or not the effect on the subject is perceived as desirable basically depends on the verb’s lexical meaning. For instance, compare the following examples (Masuoka 2000: 60; his examples):

(49) Taroo wa sensei ni atama o tatak-are-ta.

Taro TOP teacher by head ACC hit-PASS-PAST

‘Taro was hit on the head by his teacher.’

(50) Taroo wa sensei ni repooto o takaku hyooka-s-are-ta.

Taro TOP teacher by report ACC highly value-PASS-PAST

‘Taro had his report highly valued by his teacher.’

Masuoka claims that in example (49), the subject, *Taro*, is understood to be affected undesirably because the verb, (*atama o tatak*) ‘to hit (on the head)’, expresses an undesirable action. On the contrary, example (50) is interpreted as describing an event that

had a desirable effect on the subject, Taro, as the verb, (*repooto o takaku*) *hyooka-suru* ‘to value (his report highly)’, denotes a desirable situation.

According to Masuoka, the third party passive is totally different, in that the adversative interpretation is independent of the lexical meaning of the verb. This is illustrated in example (51) and (52) (Masuoka 2000: 60; his examples).

(51) Suzuki-san wa sensei ni Yoshida-san no musuko o home-rare-ta.

Mr.Suzuki TOP teacher by Mr.Yoshida GEN son ACC praise-PASS-PAST

‘Mr Suzuki was adversely affected by the teacher’s praising Mr Yoshida’s son.’

(52) Taroo wa sensei ni Yoshida-sanno repooto o takaku hyooka-s-are-ta.

Taro TOP teacher by Mr.Yoshida GEN report ACC highly value-PASS-PAST

‘Taro was adversely affected by the teacher’s highly valuing Ms Yoshida’s report.’

Although the verbs in both (51) and (52) describe desirable situations, these sentences can only be interpreted as involving subjects that are adversely affected.

The reasons Teramura and Masuoka give to determine whether the possessor passive should be considered a direct passive or an indirect passive contradict each other. However, both argue on semantic grounds: whether or not a possessor passive supports an adversative interpretation. Considering the problem of some direct passives having an adversative reading, as mentioned in Section 2.3.1, I conclude that neither Teramura’s nor

Masuoka's explanation is convincing. I, therefore, adopt Nitta's view on this matter, recognising the possessor passive⁸ as an individual group, and placing it in between the direct passive and the indirect passive.

This chapter reexamined the controversial issue of the classification of Japanese passives in previous research. Several problems have been identified. In particular, this study disagrees with the claim of a direct correlation between the syntactic and semantic distinctions made by the mainstream approaches – more specifically the correspondence between the indirect passive and the adversative passive on the one hand, and that between the direct passive and the neutral passive on the other. Instead, in the next chapter, we propose separate sets of categories for the syntactic and semantic distinctions. The syntactic distinction is developed from the mainstream approach, and the semantic classification is based on Masuoka's analysis. The thesis then demonstrates complex and subtle correlations between syntax and semantics in the case of Japanese passive constructions.

⁸ In this thesis, the possessor passive forms a part of the group called 'semi-direct passive'. See the definition in Section 3.1.3.