

Affectiveness and the Voice System of Japanese: Satisfaction Guaranteed or Your Money Back

Author(s): M. H. Klaiman

Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1982), pp. 398-413

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Affectiveness and the Voice System of Japanese:
Satisfaction Guaranteed or Your Money Back*

M.H. Klaiman
Tucson, Arizona

O. An adequate analysis of Japanese voice depends upon a coherent general approach to voice systems. Therefore I begin with early Indo-European (IE). In languages like Sanskrit and early Greek, all finite and some nonfinite verb forms are marked for a distinction ACTIVE/MIDDLE. Although most work on this system concerns its formal properties, it is standard knowledge that the system is complex, i.e., it has a semantic basis. The ACTIVE/MIDDLE category opposition signals an opposition in possible views of the action. Whereas ACTIVE indicates that the formal Subject¹ relates to the denoted action as doer, MIDDLE indicates generally "that the action is performed with special reference to the subject" (Smyth 1974:390)--specifically, "that the 'action' or 'state' affects the subject of the verb or his interests" (Lyons 1968:373. All emphases mine.)

To illustrate: if a situation consists of X bathing Y, then the Subject X is doer with respect to the action. But if X bathes X, then the doer Subject is also affected. This second situation, called reflexive, is one of several for which early IE languages typically choose middle voice endings over active.² Like the reflexive, these functions all cover situations in which the Subject is viewed as affected by the action. The MIDDLE category, then, subsumes several semantically affective functions, while the ACTIVE category is defined by a single function: Subject is not affected by the action, but is simply doer.³

In early IE languages most verbs admit both active and middle inflections.⁴ Nevertheless no one has proposed that ACTIVE and MIDDLE be treated as derivationally related--i.e., in semantic terms, doer Subjects and affected Subjects are analyzed on an equal footing. (Not so in current work on ACTIVE/PASSIVE systems, which I will get into momentarily.) Early IE is not an ACTIVE/PASSIVE system--in fact, it proves that in natural voice systems a PASSIVE is not the only possible counterpart to an ACTIVE voice category. It can be said, though, that in early IE there is a Plain Passive voice function. This function covers situations in which the Subject is not doer of any action, but is purely affected. In the original IE voice system, the Plain Passive function was subsumed under the MIDDLE voice category.⁵ In time, the old MIDDLE category was lost; the Plain Passive function became the basis for a new voice category, the PASSIVE; and many of the other voice functions of the old MIDDLE category reorganized under the opposing category, the ACTIVE. This sequence of changes is said to have yielded the voice system of modern English.⁶

Currently the formal PASSIVE of English and other languages is treated as a rule derived variant of the ACTIVE. The passive is regarded as a process for moving NPs out of (and oftentimes into

subject position.⁷ It is also claimed that the NPs that can move into subject position are limited to direct objects (original or derived⁸). The process itself is said to be language universal.⁹ I shall refer to it henceforth as the pure syntactic passive.

It was pointed out as early as 1971 by R. Lakoff that theories of pure syntactic passive fail to account for some formally passive constructions of English. Davison 1980 has labeled such constructions (oddly, not the linguists whose theories fail to account for them) as 'peculiar', i.e., 'peculiar passives'. Among them are sentences whose formal subjects correspond to oblique objects in the nearest active. Several instances are shown in (1):

- (1) a. This bed was once slept in by George Washington.
 - b. This needle hasn't been sewn with so far.
 - c. Dinner was sat through by all in stony silence.
- (Davison 1980:46)

Also peculiar, according to Lakoff, is the so called get-passive, illustrated in (2):

- (2) a. Miss Nova Scotia got (herself) disqualified from the competition.
- b. Prof. Schlemiel's new theory got, so to speak, ped all over at the ZLS conference.

Barber 1975 tantalizingly suggests that the get-passive signals a restructuring of the modern English ACTIVE/PASSIVE voice system in the direction of an incipient ACTIVE/MIDDLE system. Unfortunately her work is sketchy in describing the semantic properties of get-passives, and the role semantic factors may play in diachronic change. The semantics of the get-passive are more fully investigated by Chappell 1980. R. Lakoff earlier theorized that get-passives are akin to 'middle's'. Chappell claims that get-passives express that the Subject is affected in consequence of the denoted action, often adversely so--a function not incommensurate with the functions of the IE MIDDLE. Davison notes that some 'peculiar passives' express a property or attribute of the Subject (see e.g. 1a). Both functions, the affective and the attributive, are exemplified in a certain class of constructions (called 'passive') in Japanese. This is to say that the functions of Japanese 'passives' are similar to the functions of precisely those passivelike English constructions which go unaccounted for under the theory of pure syntactic passive.

The pure syntactic passive is not an idea of recent provenance. In 1924, Jespersen treated English passives and actives as formal variants--though he took care to point out that the English system is not a voice system (pp. 164ff.). Modern writers are not always as circumspect. They sometimes label the pure syntactic passive a voice, indifferent to the fact that grammatical voice has a semantic basis.¹⁰ They construct 'universal' theories of voice which assume that ACTIVE and PASSIVE are rule governed variants, leaving out of discussion alternative systems like IE ACTIVE/MIDDLE. There is presently

no comprehensive complex theory of grammatical voice, and linguists sometimes treat as passives constructions which do not conform to the properties of the pure syntactic passive at all. This especially occurs when the construction in question merely fails to conform to the Western ethnolinguistic attitude that sentential Subject **represents** par excellence the doer of the denoted action.¹¹ Among other things, this view implies that constructions with non-doer Subjects should be treated as less basic or more marked than constructions in which Subject is doer. I believe that this and this alone motivates the current view that -(r)are- constructions in Japanese are passives. In this paper I suggest three grounds for not treating them as passive. The first argument is syntactic or formal; the second semantic; and the last, comparative or cross-linguistic.

1. Writers on Japanese refer to as 'passive' constructions in which the verb is marked with the stem formant -(r)are-. Over the past decade a lot has been written on these constructions. The nonspecialist perusing this material cannot fail to be impressed with the inconsistencies and differences of opinion therein.¹²

For instance, many writers assume a distinction between two types of -(r)are- constructions which for convenience can be called type one and type two.¹³ They are illustrated respectively in (3a, b):

- (3) a. senkyoosi wa hitokui ni taberareta¹⁴
 missionary top cannibal IO eat--(r)are-past
 'The missionary was eaten by cannibals'
- b. haha wa kodomo ni okasi o taberareta
 mother top child IO sweet obj eat--(r)are-past
 'The mother was subjected to the child eating
 the sweet'

It is said that type one superficially resembles the English passive and type two does not. Supposedly, in type two constructions, the formal subject is an 'extra' NP, absent from the nearest active sentential counterpart. There has long been a raging controversy as to whether types one and two have underlying structures which are the same (uniform) or different (nonuniform). To my knowledge this controversy is still unresolved.¹⁵ I shall return to the matter of types one and two below.

Against this background of contention it is interesting that Japanese specialists have no disagreement at all about labeling the -(r)are- construction a 'passive'. All, further, assume that an active counterpart figures somewhere in the derivation of 'passives'. Nowhere have I seen this assumption questioned or justified.

In itself it is an arbitrary decision to label -(r)are- constructions as 'Tom', 'Dick', 'Harry' or 'passive'.¹⁶ On the other hand, pace Shibatani 1977:796, nothing is more alarming than a theoretical claim advanced on the basis of an arbitrary terminology. Shibatani illustrates that -(r)are- constructions have 'real' subjects--subjects that conform to the formal behavior typical of Japanese subjects. This and the arbitrary choice of the label

'passive' lead the same writer (1975, 1977) into a substantive claim that subjects of -(r)are- constructions are derived rather than basic, and more generally, that -(r)are- constructions are rule-derived variants of non-(r)are- counterparts. Essentially the same claim is made by Shimizu 1975 in a different framework (relational grammar).

Shimizu points out, however, that Japanese presents one special problem. In the pure syntactic passive, by definition, subjects are derived only from underlying direct objects. Japanese is exceptional. Its 'passive' subjects seem to correspond not only to direct objects but also to various oblique objects in the nearest 'actives'. According to Shimizu's examples these include indirect objects, possessor NPs, and objects of the ablative postposition kara 'from'. My data also includes examples with the postpositional phrase ni tai site 'against'. Examples (the first two from Shimizu, pp. 530-531, 534) are given in (4)-(7). The a examples represent actives and the b examples represent putative corresponding passives.

- (4) a. taroo ga hanako ni kozutumi o okuru
Taroo nom Hanako IO package obj sends
'Taroo sends a package to Hanako'
- b. hanako ga taroo ni kozutumi o okurareru
Hanako nom Taroo IO package obj send-(r)are-pres
'Hanako is sent a package by Taroo'
- (5) a. taroo wa hanako no kodomo kara omotya o totta
Taroo top Hanako gen child from toy obj took
'Taroo took a toy from Hanako's child'
- b. hanako wa taroo ni kodomo kara omotya o torareta
Hanako top Taroo IO child from toy obj take-(r)are-
past
'Hanako was subjected to Taroo taking a toy from her child'
- (6) a. taroo ga hanako kara omotya o nusunda
Taroo nom Hanako from toy obj stole
'Taroo stole a toy from Hanako'
- b. hanako ga taroo ni omotya o nusumareta
Hanako nom Taroo IO toy obj steal-(r)are-past
'Hanako was subjected to Taroo stealing a toy from her'
- (7) a. kumiai wa sono kaisya ni tai site sutoraiki o
union top that company against strike obj
okosita 'The union struck against that company'
started
- b. sono kaisya wa kumiai ni sutoraiki o okosareta
that company top union IO strike obj start-(r)are-
past
'That company was subjected to the union striking'

Judging by the examples, Japanese violates the universal claim that direct objects and only direct objects can become subjects of formal passives.¹⁷ This does not prompt Shimizu, however, to propose a separate account of -(r)are-. Instead, she argues that -(r)are- should be handled within the universal

- c. taroo wa asi o erebeetaa ni hasanda
 Taroo top leg obj elevator IO caught
 'Taroo caught his foot in the elevator'

In (9a) taroo corresponds to the main sentential subject node labeled NP_1 in (8b). Asi 'leg' corresponds to node NP_3 . Erebeetaa 'elevator' looks as though it might correspond to node NP_2 --the node representing the subject of the embedded active structure S_2 . But this is impossible, because the active sentence (9b) is unacceptable.

The nearest non-(r)are- counterpart to (9a) is (9c).¹⁹ The formal subjects of the two are identical. (This should be suspect, since no one has proposed a passive under which surface subjects derive from underlying subjects.) For the analysis illustrated in (8b) the crucial problem is that the filler for node NP_2 is not apparent. On the one hand, if nothing occupies the NP_2 slot, then it cannot be said that an underlying active subject is displaced in the course of derivation. This would eliminate any theoretical motivation for treating -(r)are- constructions as rule derived variants of 'actives' (i.e., as 'passives'). On the other hand, to save the analysis one could posit a dummy to occupy node NP_2 in the underlying structure of (9a). For instance, one could treat (9a) in the way in which uniformists treat type one constructions--even though (9a) is a type two--by positing a copy of taroo to occupy the NP_2 node. This solution would violate a semantic constraint, discussed in the next section, that a -(r)are- Subject can have no role in the denoted action other than that of victim; but let us accept the solution for the sake of argument. The solution is, essentially, that (9c) comprises the active structure underlying (9a).

Unfortunately, problematic examples are not always amenable to this solution. Consider (10):

- (10) a. taroo wa denwa ni zyuen torareta
 Taroo top telephone IO 10-yen take-(r)are-past
 'Taroo was subjected to his ten yen (coin) being taken by the (pay) phone (without rendering service)'

- b. *denwa wa taroo kara/no/ni zyuen totta
 telephone top Taroo from/gen/IO 10-yen took
 'The telephone took Taroo's ten yen'

(10a) has no obvious 'active' counterpart at all. (10b) is unacceptable, and it is impossible to construe taroo as a subject of any corresponding 'active' S. Speakers say nevertheless that (9a) and (10a) are rather natural expressions--they are typical ways of expressing everyday mechanical aggravations.²⁰ Further -(r)are- constructions that lack non-(r)are- counterparts can be cited. See (11)-(16):

- (11) taroo wa tokai no hito gomi ni momareta
 Taroo top city gen people trash IO rub-(r)are-past
 'Taroo has been rubbed (shoulders) with by city folk
 (i.e., Taroo is world-wise)'

- (12) kare wa sono hon ni kokoro o ubawareta
 he top that book IO heart obj steal-(r)are-past
 'He was enthralled (heart-stolen) by that book'
- (13) itinitizyuu watasi wa kanzya ni sibararete
 all-day I top patient IO tie-(r)are-ptcpl
 ita (Doctor speaking:)
 was 'I was tied up all day with patients'
 (Active only occurs in literal sense: 'Patients tied
 me up--e.g., with rope--all day')
- (14) kare wa kanozyo no utukusisa ni miserareta
 he top she gen beauty IO charm-(r)are-past
 'He was charmed by her beauty'
- (15) kare wa hukoo ni utihisigareta
 he top misfortune IO crush-(r)are-past
 'He was crushed by his misfortunes'
- (16) sono ikka wa kono aida no kazi de ie
 that family top this interval gen fire with house
 o yakedasareta
 obj burn-out-(r)are-past
 'That family was burned out of their home in the
 recent conflagration'

I am told that the verbs in the last three examples (14-16), practically speaking, have no non-(r)are- counterparts. That is, Japanese speakers express an inability to construct concrete examples using the hypothetical active verbs misuru, utihisigu or yakedasu.²¹ Obviously examples like (9)-(16) are troublesome to any analysis under which -(r)are- constructions are treated as rule derived variants of non-(r)are- constructions. One could force them into the structure in (8b) only by positing some ad hoc filler to occupy node NP₂, dummy style. This is all right-- unless one happens to object to ad hoc, dummy style analysis.

To summarize this section, the formal properties of -(r)are- constructions are not consistent with those of the pure syntactic passive. Any definition of the latter so weakened as to accommodate the behavior of -(r)are- constructions would be of no use or interest to universal grammar. Furthermore, certain -(r)are- constructions are difficult to reconcile with the analysis represented in (8b), an analysis in which the active counterpart S is embedded in the passive matrix. This concludes the formal grounds for suggesting that -(r)are- constructions might best be analyzed other than as passives. The next section offers further grounds, the premise for which is semantic.

2. In this section only a few of the semantic properties of -(r)are- constructions are very briefly outlined. It is then suggested that no existing account of -(r)are- in terms of the pure syntactic passive predicts any of these properties.

Semantically there are two kinds of -(r)are- constructions, affective and nonaffective. In affective -(r)are- constructions the Subject's participation in the action is limited to his affectedness--he can play no other or additional role. This semantic condition explains why there are no such examples as (17):

- (17) *taroo wa zibun ni teppoo de utareta
 Taroo top self IO gun with shoot-(r)are-past
 'Taroo was subjected to being shot by himself
 with a gun'

From a Japanese standpoint the act expressed in (17) is schizophrenic--the victim is also doer. The same explanation applies to (18) (taken from N. McCawley 1972:263):

- (18) a. hirosi wa mitiko to kekkon sita 'H. married
 Hirosi top Mitiko with married M.'
 b. *mitiko wa hirosi ni kekkon sareta
 Mitiko top Hirosi IO marry-(r)are-past
 'M. was subjected to being married by H.'

The starring of the b example is due to the fact that the Subject is not just affected but also does something. X cannot marry Y if Y fails to participate. But in Japanese, Subjects of -(r)are- constructions do nothing. This is true of affective -(r)are- constructions; it also holds of nonaffective -(r)are- constructions.

Let me explain what a nonaffective -(r)are- construction is. Contrary to a common view of -(r)are- constructions, there is no correlation of the nonaffective/affective semantic distinction with the type one/type two formal distinction.²² Thus the Howards 1976 point out that there are type one constructions which are semantically affective, even adversative. (3a) is an instance. It does not report an objective event but connotes what is a misfortune from the Subject's viewpoint. By the same token there are type two constructions which are not semantically affective; (19) illustrates:

- (19) sono e wa hiroku na o sirarete iru
 that picture top widely name obj know-(r)are-ptcpl is
 'The name of that picture is widely known'

Affectiveness, then, is not determined by the form of a -(r)are- construction (in terms of type one/type two). It is determined by semantic conditions, discussed in detail in Klaiman (in preparation). The conditions are summarized in (20):

- (20) a. Subject affectability condition: The sentential Subject must be animate and must be conscious, or have a potential for (faculty of) consciousness.
 b. Performer effectability condition: The performer (source) of the denoted action must be animate or, if inanimate, must be viewed as inherently capable of initiating and carrying out the action; an inert entity cannot be a performer.

An affective -(r)are- construction is one which is unacceptable if it fails to meet one or both conditions.²³ An acceptable construction which can violate one or both conditions is semantically nonaffective. (19) is a nonaffective construction that violates only condition (20a). (21) violates both:

- (21) ikutuka no zyuuyoo na kizi ga/wa sono hon
 several gen importance adj article nom/top that book
 ni²⁴ hukumarete iru
 IO include-(r)are-ptcpl is

'Several important articles are included in that book'

Affective and nonaffective -(r)are- constructions differ somewhat as regards the kinds of actions they express. Affective -(r)are- constructions generally express action which the performer does, thereby entailing Subject's affectedness. Non-affective -(r)are- constructions tend to express process-type actions which can be viewed as attributes of Subject. The contrast is illustrated in (22):

- (22) a. *haha wa kodomo ni okasi o taberareta (=3b)*
 mother top child IO sweet obj eat-(r)are-past
 'The mother was subjected to the child eating
 the sweet'
- b. **okasi wa kodomo ni taberareta*
 sweet top child IO eat-(r)are-past
 'The sweet was eaten by the child'
- c. *sono ki wa siroari ni (yotte) hidoku taberareta*
 that wood top termite IO due-to badly eat-(r)are-
 past
 'That wood has been badly eaten up by termites'

(22a) expresses a specific act of eating (a deed) entailing the affectedness of the formal Subject haha 'mother'. (22b) is odd as a literal translation of its English gloss--it requires the affectedness of some unmentioned party to be read into it in order to make sense. This is because its Subject, okasi 'sweet', is semantically nonaffectable (cf. 20a). However, (22c), whose Subject is equally nonaffectable, is acceptable. This is because the action of eating is viewed differently--not as a specific deed or event of eating but as a process whose effects are attributed to the Subject.²⁵

This section has been an extremely brief summary of some semantic properties of -(r)are- constructions. These properties are: the pure non-doer character of Subject; the affectability and effectability conditions (20) which distinguish affective and nonaffective uses of -(r)are-; and the difference which these uses reflect in speakers' views of the action (deed vs. attribute). These properties and others are further discussed in Klaiman (in preparation). The point of the present discussion is that it is hard to see how the theory of pure syntactic passive entails any of these semantic properties. Thus e.g., in English, just those formal passives which share with -(r)are- the characteristic of expressing attributive and affective semantic functions fail to be accounted for by standard theories of passivization (see again section 0). Clearly, leaving semantic properties out of account means omitting the most crucial information which the user of Japanese has to know about the construction. This is a second ground for not treating -(r)are- constructions within an account of pure syntactic passive.

3. The -(r)are- construction can and should be evaluated in light of features it shares with concrete phenomena in other natural languages. In early IE languages, voice is based on a semantic distinction between situations in which the Subject's role is purely doer vs. situations in which Subject is affected. Affectedness does not exclude the possibility that the Subject

also plays a doer role (e.g., in the reflexive --X does action to X). The ACTIVE is appropriate only when the Subject is doer and not affected.

In Japanese it is the reverse--only the Subject which is in no way doer is a potential -(r)are- Subject. The voice systems of Japanese and early IE are clearly not the same. But they are strictly comparable. They can and should be handled by one comprehensive theory of grammatical voice.

A comprehensive theory is also needed to relate these to similar systems in other languages. I shall not comment on the similarity of -(r)are- to phenomena in languages of the general Southeast Asian area; these are remarked on elsewhere.²⁶ However, one strikingly similar system not previously noted as such occurs in Tamil, a Dravidian language of South India. In Tamil, all finite and some nonfinite verbal stems are marked for a formal opposition known as Weak/Strong. Paramasivam 1979 reveals that Weak/Strong is correlated with a semantic opposition he calls affective/effective. An affective verb is said to denote an action whose affect bears primarily on the Subject. An effective verb denotes an action which does not primarily affect the Subject but which--to borrow Paramasivam's words (p. 95)--is "effected by the subject" (vis-a-vis some nonSubject party). This theory is designed to account, among other things, for the formal and semantic differences between (23a,b):

- (23) a. kuzantai k̄alai utai-kir̄-atu (Paramasivam 1979:95)
 child-nom leg-acc kick-presWeak-agreement
 'The child is kicking its legs (in the air)'
 b. kuzantai ennai utai-kkir̄-atu (ibid.)
 child-nom me-acc kick-presStrong-agreement
 'The child is kicking me'

In (23a) the entity primarily affected by the action of kicking is the Subject itself, while in (23b) the primarily affected entity is other than the Subject.

Paramasivam (pp. 106ff.) points out that the Tamil AFFECTIVE/EFFECTIVE system is neither synchronically nor diachronically related to the ACTIVE/MIDDLE voice system of Sanskrit, an early IE language. It is true that the conceptual bases of the two systems differ. This does not mean both are not voice systems.²⁷ The Japanese system, too, differs in precise conceptual makeup from both the IE and Tamil systems, but again this does not mean it must be treated as other than a voice system.²⁸ On the contrary, the fundamental similarity of the phenomena in early IE, Tamil and especially Japanese cry out for a comprehensive general account. (Klaiman in preparation is a first approximation.) Such an account must substantially concern itself with the complex character of grammatical voice--the fact that natural voice systems have a common semantic basis. A theory of pure syntactic passive--whatever its usefulness in natural language analysis--is not designed to meet this need. This is the third of three grounds for the position that Japanese -(r)are- should be accounted for other than under the rubric of pure syntactic passive.

Footnotes

*I am indebted to three Japanese speakers for data: Takako Tomoda, Atsuko Fuji and Hiromi Yamaguchi. I am especially indebted to a Japanese specialist and friend whose graciousness one finds all too infrequently emulated: my unlimited thanks to Hiroko Nishio. Errors are not their responsibility. This research was performed without office space, funding, secretarial assistance or other accoutrements of scholarly endeavor. Hence the subtitle.

¹The term Subject (as opposed to subject) refers to the referent of any formal sentential subject.

²Functions of the category MIDDLE can be summarized and illustrated as follows (from Klaiman in preparation):

- a. Plain Middle: results of action accrue to Subject
Gr. politeu-omai 'I carry out civic rights for myself' (Barber 1975:18)
- b. Reciprocal Middle: referents of plural Subject do action to one another
Gr. lou-ometha 'We wash each other' (ibid., p. 19)
- c. Reflexive Middle: Subject performs action to self
Gr. lou-omai 'I wash myself' (ibid.)
- d. Deponent Middle: action denotes physical/mental disposition of Subject
Skt. ās-te 'sits', śe-te 'lies'
- e. Nucleonic Middle: object of action belongs to, moves into, or moves from sphere of Subject
Skt. ādat-te 'takes (for oneself)', vikrīṇī-te 'sells (gives for profit)'
- f. Plain Passive: Subject does nothing, is affected in consequence of action
Skt. katah kriyate 'The mat is made'

³The IE voice system can be schematized as follows (after Barber 1975). See preceding footnote for explanations of MIDDLE voice functions.

ACTIVE	MIDDLE	
Plain Active	Plain Middle	Deponent Middle
	Reciprocal Middle	Nucleonic Middle
	Reflexive Middle	Plain Passive

⁴Early IE languages also have "a certain number of verbs that possess only one series of endings; some are only active, others only middle. . . . activa tantum and media tantum . . ." (Benveniste 1971:147). Verbs of the media tantum class are sometimes referred to as deponent middles (see outline of corresponding function in footnote 2, d). Japanese, like early IE, has some verbs which never take the 'passive' stem formant -(r)are- (e.g., wakaru 'understand'); other verbs which invariably take -(r)are- (see text, exes. 14-16); and verbs which may or may not take -(r)are-. As in IE, the last class comprises most of the verbs of the language.

²This is mentioned in Lyons 1968:373 and Barber 1975:21.

⁶The sequence of changes can be inferred by comparing the voice schemata of modern English below (based on Barber 1975)

with the IE voice schemata given in footnote 3.

ACTIVE		PASSIVE
Plain Active	Reciprocal Middle	Plain Passive
Plain Middle	Reflexive Middle	

⁷Referring to unpublished research by David Perlmutter and Paul Postal, Barber 1975:16 expresses a view of passive as follows: 'The passive has been argued to be fundamentally a strategy to move NP's in and out of subject position.' A later view (Comrie 1977) is that passive universally moves NPs out of but not necessarily into subject position. It is assumed that the reader is familiar with these views.

⁸Thus Davison 1980:50 remarks, 'I will assume that promotion of indirect objects by Passive occurs only via the intermediate step of promotion to direct object by Dative Movement (Johnson [1979]. . .)'.

⁹For a formal proposal on a universal characterization of the process, see Perlmutter and Postal 1977. I assume that the pure syntactic passive as a language universal is model-independent. The substantive claims of transformationalists, relational grammarians, arc-pair proponents and so on tend to be the same as regards passive, even though the models differ in outer trappings. In short, it is the pure syntactic passive as a view of passive which is under consideration here--not any particular model.

¹⁰For instance, DeLancey 1981:627, footnote three, refers to passives as well as their intellectual bedfellows, ergatives, in terms of 'voice'. Processes whereby NPs of various functional roles are moved into subject position are typical of Malayo-Polynesian languages; and one such language (Malagasy) has been said to possess a 'voice' system (Keenan 1976b). The rationale for the use of the term 'voice' is specifically stated by neither of these writers.

¹¹In 'Towards a universal definition of subject', it is claimed, as a component of the universal definition of subject, that 'b[asic]-subjects normally express the agent of the action, if there is one' (Keenan 1976a:321). This heroic (dare I say: masculine?) characterization of subject expresses nothing more than an ethnolinguistic prejudice. It ignores the perfectly valid view (grammaticalized in many non-European languages) of Subject as victim. For elaboration, see Klaiman in preparation.

¹²For instance, Howard and Niyekawa-Howard claim that 'inanimate nouns are not normally appropriate subjects of passive sentences' (1976:215), while Kuroda lists conditions under which 'an inanimate noun phrase may be the subject of a ni passive sentence' (1977:27). Also, Evans and Kameyama claim (p. 2) that the following Japanese sentence is acceptable, while Wierzbicka 1979:156 labels an equivalent sentence as impossible:

boku ga ie ni yakerareta
I nom house IO burn-(r)are-past

'I was subjected to my house burning down'

Japanese speakers to whom I have put the above example judge it unacceptable.

¹³The terms applied to the two types vary greatly from writer to writer. N. McCawley 1972 refers to types one and two respectively as 'plain' and 'affective'; Kuno 1973 as 'pure' and 'adversity'; the Howards 1976 as 'direct' and 'indirect'; Clark 1974 as 'pure' and 'inflictive'.

¹⁴In Japanese, the nominative marker ga deletes before the topic marker wa. I have labeled ni as 'IO' (indirect object) for typographical convenience, although ni marks various functions in addition to the indirect object.

¹⁵The controversy is reviewed by Kuno 1978. It is pointed out by him that both sides have strong and weak points and the conclusion is offered that 'the controversy . . . has not yet been resolved . . . and will be continued for many years to come' (p. 273).

¹⁶'Passive' is a terminological convenience. What should one call the construction if not 'passive'? It is suggested (Klaiman in preparation) that an adequate terminology presupposes a comprehensive new theory of grammatical voice, no less. If so, it is not surprising if many writers opt for the familiar if inappropriate term 'passive', especially since its use is inconsistent with the assumption spoken of in footnote eleven. The consistency lies in the fact (also pointed out in the main text, below) that Subjects of -(r)are- constructions are never doers in a semantic sense.

¹⁷Possibly one could still claim this of Japanese by positing intermediate structures in which the underlying oblique objects occupy derived direct object status, later to be promoted to subject by passive. I am unaware of any concrete proposal along these lines. (I wouldn't put it past some linguist to propose something of the sort, however.)

¹⁸The analysis represented in (8b) conveniently, but unfortunately, also skirts the issue of the Subject's permissible relationship to the denoted action. Some discussion is given in the main text, below. Also see Klaiman in preparation.

¹⁹Sentences (9a) and (9c) are not equivalent semantically. (9c) would most likely express a situation in which the Subject (taroo) does something--most possibly out of intention, but also possibly without intention--as a result of which the elevator catches his foot. (9a) most likely expresses a situation in which the Subject does nothing--perhaps the elevator door closes automatically; perhaps a sloppy operator accidentally closes it on Taroo's foot. (If someone else closes the door deliberately on Taroo's foot, it may be more appropriate to use erebeetaa de rather than erebeetaa ni.) Note, however, that Taroo may be viewed as in some way responsible for his accident, even if he overtly does nothing, and that this situation may be expressed by (9a). In this connection see Nishio 1980.

²⁰In -(r)are- constructions in which the Subject's affectedness is expressed, the performer or source of the action is agentive in the sense given in Cruse 1973. Roughly, this means that the performer is animate and conscious, or relates to the

activity as if it were. Expressions like (9a) and (10a) conjure up an almost Chaplinesque universe wherein man is inexorably thwarted by perverse contraptions with seeming minds of their own. My data sample includes other such instances. They are commented on in Klaiman in preparation.

²¹Such verbs can be thought to belong to the Japanese version of the media tantum class. See again footnote four.

²²The assumption that type one constructions are semantically nonaffective and type twos affective shows up in Kuno 1973:24, N. McCawley 1972:259, and Wierzbicka 1979:118, inter alia. Klaiman in preparation shows on several grounds that the putative correlation is descriptively inaccurate.

²³A construction may casually meet both conditions, without either being essential to its acceptability. Consider:

watasi wa senseitani ni (yotte) manaa o osierareta
 I top teachers IO due-to manners obj teach-(r)are-past
 'I was taught manners by my teachers'

This is not an expression of a deed on someone's part nor of the Subject's affectedness. It is an expression of a process which has brought about a certain attribute of the Subject. A tipoff to this is the optional admissibility of yotte (ni yotte means 'due to, on the part of'). Yotte is a participle of yoru 'lean on, rely on, depend on, owe to'. Its meaning suggests attribution. It is well known, moreover, that ni yotte cannot mark the performer NP in -(r)are- constructions which are semantically affective. The distribution of ni yotte is consistent with the deed/attribute account of speakers' view of action in -(r)are- constructions. See details in Klaiman in preparation.

²⁴Kuroda 1977:6-7 cites a claim attributed to K. Inoue to the effect that ni is a variant of de (said to be an instrumental marker) when it marks inanimate NPs in -(r)are- constructions. Ex. (21) is a counterexample. Here ni cannot be replaced by de.

²⁵The optional admissibility of yotte in (22c) suggests this. See again footnote 23.

²⁶See inter alia Clark 1974. Further references are provided in Klaiman in preparation.

²⁷It simply means they cannot be the same voice system. The Tamil voice system can be represented schematically as follows. (Compare with the IE schemata in footnote three. For exegesis, see Klaiman in preparation.)

AFFECTIVE

Plain Affective

Subject performs action and is affected in consequence of acting

EFFECTIVE

Plain Effective

Subject performs action which primarily affects nonSubject entity

Reflexical Effective

Subject performs action and action affects Subject, but Subject not affected purely in consequence of acting

Affectless Effective

action entails no affect; affectless action; action viewed as mere attribute of Subject

28 The Japanese voice system may be represented schematically as follows (from Klaiman in preparation, which see).

UNMARKED (-ø-)

Plain Unmarked
Subject relates to
action as doer

MARKED (-(r)are-)

Affective Marked

affectable Subject is affected in
consequence of deed performed by
effectable entity; Subject does
not otherwise participate in action

Attributive (Nonaffective) Marked
Subject does nothing; nonaffective
action is viewed as attribute of
Subject and may be attributable to
a performer or source

References

- Barber, E.J.W. 1975. Voice--beyond the passive. BLS 1, 16-24.
- Benveniste, E. 1971. Active and middle voice in the verb. In M. Meek (translator), Problems in general linguistics. Coral Gables: U. of Miami Press, 145-151.
- Chappell, H. 1980. Is the get-passive adversative? Papers in Linguistics 13 (3), 411-452.
- Clark, M. 1974. Submissive verbs as adversatives in some Asian languages. In Nguyen, ed., South-east Asian linguistic studies. Canberra: Australian National U., 89-110.
- Comrie, B. 1977. In defense of spontaneous demotion: The impersonal passive. In P. Cole and J. Sadock (eds.), Syntax and semantics 8 (Grammatical relations). NY: Academic Press, 47-58.
- Cruse, D.A. 1973. Some thoughts on agentivity. J. of Linguist. 9 (1), 11-23.
- Davison, A. 1980. Peculiar passives. Lg. 56 (1), 42-66.
- DeLancey, S. 1981. An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns. Lg. 57 (3), 626-655.
- Evans, D.A., and Kameyama, M. Intransitive passives and relational grammar. ms.
- Howard, I., and Niyekawa-Howard, A.M. 1976. Passivization. In M. Shibatani (ed.), Syntax and semantics 5 (Japanese generative grammar). NY: Academic Press, 201-237.
- Jespersen, O. 1924 (1965). The philosophy of grammar. NY: Norton.
- Johnson, D. 1979. Toward a theory of relationally based grammar. NY: Garland.
- Keenan, E. 1976a. Towards a universal definition of 'subject'. In C. Li (ed.), Subject and topic. NY: Academic Press, 305-333.
- Keenan, E. 1976b. Remarkable subjects in Malagasy. In C. Li (ed.), Subject and topic. NY: Academic Press, 249-301.
- Klaiman, M.H. Affectiveness and the semantic basis of grammar. In preparation.
- Kuno, S. 1973. The structure of the Japanese language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kuno, S. 1978. Theoretical perspectives on Japanese linguistics. In J. Hinds and I. Howard (eds.), Problems in Japanese

- syntax and semantics. Tokyo: Kaitakusha, 213-285.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1977. On Japanese passives. Reproduced. (1979: in G. Bedell et al., eds., *Exploration in linguistics: In honor of Kazuko Inoue*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.)
- Lakoff, R. 1971. Passive resistance. CLS 7, 149-162.
- Lyons, J. 1968. *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- McCawley, N.A. 1972. On the treatment of Japanese passives. CLS 8, 259-270.
- Nishio, H. 1980. Adversity causatives in Japanese. Read at LSA winter meeting, San Antonio.
- Paramasivam, K. 1979. Effectivity and causativity in Tamil. Int'l. J. of Dravidian Linguistics 8 (1), 71-151.
- Perlmutter, D., and Postal, P. 1977. Toward a universal characterization of passivization. BLS 3, 394-417.
- Shibatani, M. 1975. Pre-lexical versus post-lexical raising in Japanese. CLS 11, 514-528.
- Shibatani, M. 1977. Grammatical relations and surface cases. Lg. 53 (4), 789-809.
- Shimizu, M. 1975. Relational grammar and promotion rules in Japanese. CLS 11, 529-535.
- Smyth, H.W. 1974. *Greek grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1979. Are grammatical categories vague or polysemous? The Japanese 'adversative' passive in a typological context. Papers in Linguistics 12 (1-2), 111-162.