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1. Introduction

Active transitive clauses are assumed to involve a light verb (to be represented as \( v \)) that makes available to the verbal root: (i) external argument and (ii) accusative Case.\(^1\) Given \( v \) with properties (i) and (ii), passives could be distinguished from actives by the absence of \( v \) or by assuming additional functional heads without properties (i) or (ii) (Bowers 2010, Hasegawa 2001, 2004, Hoshi 1999, 2011, Kratzer 1996, Fukuda 2006 inter alia). The former approach would need some means to explain the lexically restricted distribution of unaccusatives in contrast to passives, which are productively derived from almost all transitive verbs.\(^2\) On the other hand, the latter can easily make the distinction but might lead to undesirable proliferation of light verbs. For instance, Hasegawa (2001, 2004) posits two binary features [+Object Case] and [+external role] in UG, and argues that the four possible combinations are instantiated in Japanese. This theory predicts the four constructions to be equally available in other languages; however, active transitives, which are to be analyzed as involving [+Object Case]/[+external role], and their passive counterparts with [-Object Case]/[-external role] are widely attested, but adversative passives with [+Object Case]/[-external role] are crosslinguistically rarer according to Shibatani (1990:328-329), Huang (1999) and Washio (1993, 1995).

The line of analyses advocated by Jaeggli (1986), and Baker, Johnson and Roberts (BJR, 1989) differs from either of the above; they essentially claim that English-type passives involve \( v \) just as actives, and that the participle ending (represented as -EN) is nominal, which functions as a bearer of Case and an external argument, thereby cancelling out properties (i) and (ii). More generally speaking, the ‘absorption’ of Case and external \( \theta \)-role is due to a designated nominal element available in each language. This can straightforwardly explain why most transitive verbs become passives. I will claim that the Japanese passive morpheme \( \text{sare} \) is non-distinct from the \( v \) \( (\text{saru}) \) and its variants with respect to (i) and (ii), and that an empty pronominal \( \text{pro} \) plays the role of –EN in Germanic and Romance languages. One objection might be that the subject of actives is always ‘logical,’ being directly \( \theta \)-related to verbs, while that of passives is indirectly \( \theta \)-related to verbs via its trace in object position. I will show that transitives with non-thematic subjects (Tr-NS) exist, pursuing a ‘uniform’ approach to Tr-NSs and three major types of passives in Japanese.

2. Transitives with a Non-thematic Subject (Tr-NS) in Japanese

If \( \text{sare} \) and \( (\text{saru}) \) share properties (i) and (ii), why do they typically constitute distinct constructions? Specifically, \( \text{sare} \) always has a non-thematic subject, while \( (\text{saru}) \) and its variants typically have a thematic subject. Actually, a non-thematic subject is possible with the latter under certain conditions.

(1a) and (2a) are typical transitive sentences with a thematic/agentive subject, while (1b) and (2b) are normally interpreted as: someone/something other than the subject undertook the action (Inoue 1976, Oehrle and Nishio 1981, Miyagawa 1989, Kageyama 1993).

---

\(^1\) If types of abstract Case are irrelevant in the computational system as claimed by Marantz (1992), ‘accusative’ in property (ii) should not be mentioned.


(1) a. John-ga Mary-no komaku-o yabu(k)-i-ta.
   NOM eardrum-ACC rupture-TR-PAST
   'John ruptured Mary’s eardrum.'

b. John-ga komaku-o yabu(k)-i-ta.
   NOM eardrum-ACC rupture-TR-PAST
   'John had his eardrum ruptured.'

(2) a. Isha-ga John-no keccho-o tekishutu-si-ta.
    doctor-NOM colon-ACC removal-DO-PAST
    'The doctor removed John’s colon.'

    NOM colon-ACC removal-DO-PAST
    'John had his colon removed.'

For example, John in (1a) is an agent, causing the rupture of Mary's eardrum, while John in (1b), if not insane, did nothing directly to his ear. I take (1b) and (2b) as exemplifying Tr-NSs.3

One condition on the Tr-NS construction is that the subject needs to be ‘included’ in the event expressed by the verb, typically being the inalienable possessor of the object: John's eardrum in (1b) and the patient's colon in (2b).4 (1a) and (2a) do not allow the non-agentive interpretation on their subject.

Another restriction has to do with the morphological classification of verbal roots. The verbal root is native Japanese yabuk in (1b), while it is Sino-Japanese tekishutu in (2b). When the root is native Japanese, it can form a Tr-NS if it allows transitivity alternation as shown in (3) and (4b).

(3) John-no komaku-ga yabuk-e-ta.
    GEN eardrum-NOM rupture-INTR-PAST
    'John’s eardrum ruptured.'

(4) a. John-ga ie-o ya(k)-i-ta.
    NOM house-ACC burn-TR-PAST
    'John had his house burnt down.'

    GEN house-NOM burn-INTR-PAST
    'John’s house burnt down.'

(3) and (4b) are the intransitive counterparts of (1b) and (4a), respectively; the thematic status of John is non-agentive in both. Pure transitives like hum (step-on) cannot form the Tr-NS construction; the subject is interpreted as agentive, irrespective of the presence of the possessor coreferential with the subject as shown in (5a-c).

    NOM foot-ACC step-on-PAST
    'John stepped on Mary foot.'

b. John-ga asi-o hum-da
    NOM foot-ACC step-on-PAST
    'John stepped on his own/someone's foot.'

---

3 Hasegawa (1999) uses a similar pair of examples with the Sino-Japanese verbal noun shujutu (operation) without mentioning the difference in the interpretation of the subject.  
4 Tr-NSs with Sino-Japanese verbal roots like (2b) and (7b) involve the inalienable possession relation between the subject and the object. Tr-NSs with the alienable possession relation are also possible:  
   (i) John-wa shuuriya-ni denwa-o site pasokon-o shuuri-si-ta.
      TOP mechanic-to telephone-ACC do PC-ACC repair-do-PAST
      'John had his PC fixed by calling up a mechanic.'

The most natural interpretation of (i) is that John did nothing directly to his PC; he called up a mechanic and asked him to repair his PC.
GEN foot-NOM step-on-past  
[no intransitive counterpart]

As for pairs like (1b)/(3) and (4a,b), Inoue (1974: 61) observes an important difference: the subject of Tr-NS is interpreted as being responsible for the event expressed by the predicate (see also Miyagawa 1989 and Oehrle and Nishio 1981). Imposition of the non-thematic role on the subject of Tr-NS will be discussed in Sections 3 and 5.

Going back to (2b) with a Sino-Japanese root, it lacks the intransitive counterpart as shown in (6a).

(7a-c) illustrate the same point (Tsujimura 1990).

GEN colon-NOM removal-DO-PAST  
[no intransitive counterpart]  
'*John's colon removed.

b. Isya niyoru keccho-no tekishutu 
[passive nominal]  
docto-by colon-GEN removal  
'removal of a colon by a doctor'

(7) a. Isya-ga John-no ha-o chiryo-si-ta. 
doctor-NOM GEN tooth-ACC treatment-DO-PAST  
[agentive transitive]  
'The doctor treated John's tooth.'

NOM tooth-ACC treatment-DO-PAST  
[Tr-NS]  
'John had his tooth treated.'

GEN tooth-NOM treatment-DO-PAST  
[no intransitive counterpart]  
'*John's tooth treated.'

d. Isya niyoru ha-no chiryo 
[passive nominal]  
doctor by tooth-GEN treatment  
'treatment of a tooth by a doctor.'

Instead, the verbal roots of Tr-NS can form 'passive' nominals without overt morphology as in (6b) and (7d).5

The generalizations on Tr-NS with native and Sino-Japanese roots can be unified as follows:

(8) The Tr-NS construction is possible with those verbal roots that need not syntactically realize an external argument: native Japanese roots forming transitive/intransitive pairs and Sino-Japanese roots allowing the 'passive' interpretation.

3. Transitives and Indirect Passives

The existence of Tr-NSs in Japanese has shown that the subject of certain transitive predicates headed by *uru or its variants can be non-thematic just like the subject of passives with rare. Another similarity between transitive and passive light verbs is that rare in indirect passives exhibits properties (i) and (ii) of transitives, as shown in (9a,b).

(9) a. Otoko-ga kodomo-no kao-o tata(k)i-ta. 
man-NOM child-GEN face-ACC slap-PAST  
[transitive]  
'The man slapped the child's face.'

b. Hanako-ga otoko-ni kodomo-no kao-o tatak-(r)are-ta  
NOM man-DAT child-GEN face-ACC slap-PASS-PAST  
[Indirect passive]  
'Hanako had her/the child's face slapped by the man'

(9a,b) involve the accusative DP kodomo-no kao, and the agent of the action expressed by the verbal root otoko. One notable difference is the Case-marker on the agent: it is nominative in (9a) and dative

---

5 There are two kinds of English deverbal nouns with a by-phrase exemplified by (ib,c):

(i) a. the enemy's destruction of the city  
   b. the destruction of the city by the enemy  
   c. the city's destruction by the enemy  
   I'm not committed to which type (6b) and (7d) correspond to.
in (9b). Moreover, the indirect passive (9b) has the extra DP Hanako-ga in Spec,TP, which is interpreted as being (adversatively) affected by the event expressed by the verbal root.

(9a,b) can be analyzed as (10a,b), respectively.

\[(10)\]  
\[a.\] [**transitive**]  
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{DPint} <\sqrt{TATAK}> \\
\text{otoko} \quad \sqrt{P} \quad \sqrt{\text{TATAK}-v} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{DPext}
\end{array}\]  
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{kodomo-no kao-o} \\
\text{[aee]}
\end{array}\]

\[b.\] [**indirect passive**]  
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{DPint} <\sqrt{TATAK}> \\
\text{otoko-ni} \quad \sqrt{P} \quad \sqrt{\text{TATAK}-v \text{ rare}} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{DPext}
\end{array}\]  
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{kodomo-no kao-o} \\
\text{[aee]}
\end{array}\]

In (10a), the root $\sqrt{\text{TATAK}}$, being categorized as verbal by $v$ and incorporated into it, licenses [acc] on the internal argument DPint; the external argument DPext is $\theta$-marked in Spec,vP. The same applies to the indirect passive in (10b). As for Case-licensing of DPext, it goes out of vP in (10a) and usually gets [nom] in Spec,TP. On the other hand, DPext in (10b) gets [dat] within vP. Here I adopt the standard assumption in Japanese generative grammar that rare by its intrinsic property can license [dat] optionally (Inoue 1976, McCawley 1972, Kuno 1973, Kuroda 1979 inter alia). Then, the complex $\sqrt{\text{TATAK}}\text{-}rare$ in (10b) has two structural Cases; [acc] goes to DPint just as in (10a), and [dat] goes to DPext.

As is well-known, indirect passives can be formed with intransitive roots as in (11a).

\[(11)\]  
\[a.\] Taro-ga Hanako-ni nak-(r)are-ta.  
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{NOM} \\
\text{DAT} \\
\text{cry-PASS-PAST}
\end{array}\]  
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{DPext} \\
\text{Hanako-ni} \\
\text{[dat]}
\end{array}\]

\[b.\]  
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{DPext} \\
\text{Hanako-ni} \\
\sqrt{\text{NAK}-[v \text{ rare}]} \\
\text{[dat]}
\end{array}\]

(11a) can be analyzed as (11b). The amalgam $\sqrt{\text{NAK}}\text{-}rare$ in (11b) does not license [acc] simply because the verbal root is intransitive. Rare licenses [dat] on DPext just as in (10b).\(^6\)

Later in the derivation, the vP in (10b) and (11b) merges with T, forming a TP. Given the absence of overt (and possibly null) expletive elements in Japanese, the Spec,TP needs to host an argument DP, but the DP in question cannot be $\theta$-related to the root since the $\theta$-grid of the root has been satisfied within vP. As has been mentioned above, an extra DP in Spec,TP of indirect passive is interpreted as being indirectly affected by the event expressed by vP. In contrast, a DP in Spec,TP with the transitive vP in (10a) is $\theta$-related to the root via its trace in Spec,vP; no extra interpretation needs to be imposed on it. Remember that a DP in Spec,TP of Tr-NS is interpreted non-thematical as being responsible for the event expressed by vP. Indirect passives and Tr-NSs can be regarded as more complex or marked than transitives in that they require extra semantic interpretations on their subject.

---

\(^6\) Kageyama (1993) and others point out that indirect passives with unaccusative verbal roots are not so acceptable as those with unergatives and transitives. This generalization, if it holds, can be explained under the assumption that rare can assign [dat] only to an external argument.
4. Direct and Possessor Passives

Following Jaeggli (1986) and BJR (1989), I claim that all kinds of passive involve *v* that licenses (i) external argument and (ii) accusative Case if it merges with transitive verbal roots. This claim is straightforwardly supported by the existence of indirect passives in Japanese analyzed in Section 3. Nevertheless, passives typically do not manifest properties (i) and (ii). The tenet of Jaeggli/BJR's approach is that the past participle ending –*EN* in English and other Germanic and Romance languages functions to cancel out (i) and (ii). I will just extend their theories, claiming that empty pronominal *pro* in Japanese does the job of –*EN*. Note that indirect passives in Japanese show properties (i) and (ii) since they do not involve *pro*, as analyzed in (10b). They are crosslinguistically quite rare, and their subject requires a special interpretation. The division of labor seems to be operative between transitive and passive light verbs in their unmarked usages, the latter involving a designated nominal available in each language. In this section, I will analyze direct passives along this line, and claim that possessor passives in Japanese share a number of properties with direct passives since they involve *pro*.

One of the important questions that have been raised on Jaeggli/BJR's approach is why the designated nominal 'absorbs' accusative Case and external θ-role, which are canonically assigned to distinct elements (Bowers 2010, Collins 2005). My speculation is based on c-selection: *v* selects a verbal root phrase (*√P*) by first Merge and DPext by second Merge. –*EN* needs to merge with *v* as early as or prior to its introduction into syntax due to its morphologically bound nature. Since it is nominal rather than verbal, it counts as *v*'s external argument even if it merges with *v* before the verbal root phrase (*√P*). Another question is why –*EN* as *v*'s external argument does not block the movement of DPint out of *vP*. My answer is morphological: –*EN*, being part of the verbal amalgam, is syntactically invisible, allowing DPint to move into Spec,TP via the edge of *vP*; it is subject to m(orphological)-merger in Matushansky (2006). For this reason, the *vP* of English passive functions as a weak phase.

Given these assumptions, English passives like (12a) can be analyzed as (12b):

(12) a. John was hit by Mary.
   b. \[\text{[Direct Passive in English]}\]

Since –*EN* is the external argument of the amalgam √*HIT*-v, the *by*-phrase should be an adjunct. I will simply assume that the so-called θ-transmission between –*EN* and a *by*-phrase is on a par with clitic doubling (c.f., Anagnostopoulou 2006 and references cited therein).

Japanese passives have been classified in terms of the presence/absence of complementation (Kuroda 1965, McCawley 1972 and Kuno 1973 inter alia) and/or *ni* versus *niyotte* as the marker of agent phrases (Kuroda 1979, Kitagawa and Kuroda 1992, Hoshi 1999, 2011, Fukuda 2006 inter alia). Another important line of analyses is to isolate possessor or inclusive passives from indirect passives with transitive roots; the subject of the former is 'included' in the predicate, typically as the possessor of a direct object. Direct, indirect, and possessor passives are exemplified below:

(13) a. John-ga (Mary-ni/niyotte) hidoku tatak-(r)are-ta.
   b. \[\text{[Direct passive]}\]

'John was slapped violently by Mary.'

7 Distinct properties of *ni-* and *niyotte*-passives have been amply attested in the literature, but it does not necessarily follow that they constitute distinct passive constructions. Clearly, *niyotte* consists of the dative marker and the verb *yor*, which means 'be due to/cause by'. In some sense, *niyotte*-passives contain a participial adjunct clause rather than a complement clause contrary to the claim by Kuroda (1979) and others.
b. John-ga Mary-ni zibun-no heya-de tatak-(r)are-ta.  
   (zibun=John/*Mary)  
   ‘John was slapped by Mary in his/*her room.’

(14) a.  John-ga *(Mary-ni/*niyotte) Tom-o tatak-(r)are-ta.  
   [Indirect passive]  
   NOM    DAT(by)       ACC slap-PASS-PAST  
   ‘John had Tom slapped by Mary.’

b. John-ga Mary-ni zibun-no heya-de Tom-o tatak-(r)are-ta.  
   (zibun=John/Mary)  
   NOM  DAT self-GEN    ACC slap-PASS-PAST  
   ‘John had Tom slapped by Mary in his/her house.’

(15) a.  John-ga (Mary-ni/niyotte) kao-o tatak-(r)are-ta.  
   [Possessor passive]  
   NOM    by face-ACC hit-PASS-PAST  
   ‘John was slapped in the face by Mary.’

b. John-ga Mary-ni zibun-no heya-de Tom-o kao-o tatak-(r)are-ta.  
   (zibun=John/*Mary)  
   NOM    self-GEN room-in face-ACC hit-PASS-PAST  
   ‘John was slapped in the face by Mary in his/*her room.’

Since the possessor passives (15a,b) involve an accusative DP, they look more like the indirect passives (14a,b) rather than the direct passives (13a,b). Shibatani (1990:326-328), Kubo (1990) and Hasegawa (2007), however, observe that possessor passives are on a par with direct rather than indirect passives in several respects: the adversative meaning is absent; an agent ni/phrase is not necessary and interchangeable with niyotte as shown by the (a) examples; and an agent ni/phrase cannot be the antecedent of zibun as evidenced by the (b) examples. According to Shibatani (1990:328-329), Huang (1999), Washio (1993, 1995) inter alia, direct passives are common or virtually universal, while indirect passives are quite rare. What is interesting is that possessor passives are attested in languages that lack indirect passives: Mandarin, Cantonese, Taiwanese and Korean. The crosslinguistic evidence supports the isolation of possessor passives from indirect passives and invites us to analyze direct and possessor passives on a par as unmarked passives.

First of all, the direct passive (13a) can be analyzed in the same manner as the English direct passive in (12) as follows:

(16)  [Direct Passive in Japanese]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[v rare]} & \quad \text{pro} \\
\text{DPint} & \quad \sqrt{\text{TATAK}} \quad [v \text{ rare}] \quad \text{pro} \\
\text{vP} & \quad \sqrt{\text{P}} \\
\text{John} & \quad \text{[aee]} \leftrightarrow [\text{aee}] / \text{Aext}
\end{align*}
\]

DPint in (16) is θ-marked within vP but Case-licensed in Spec,TP. The accusative Case and external θ-role of the root-v amalgam are assigned to (or absorbed by) pro. Since pro is an external argument, the ni/niyotte phrase is an adjunct, being optional and unable to antecede the reflexive zibun. Like –EN, pro is m-merged with rare and syntactically invisible, allowing DPint to move into Spec,TP and failing to antecede the reflexive zibun. For this reason, the vP of Japanese direct passive functions as a weak phase.

Fukuda (2006) presents an ingenious argument to show that possessor passives fall under indirect passives; the subject of possessor passives like (i) is base-generated and not derived via the movement of the possessor.

(i)  Taro-ga Hanako-ni (Jiro-no-de-wa naku) zibuni-no ashi-o ker-(r)are-ta
   
   NOM  DAT Cop-TOP not  self-GEN leg-ACC kick-pass-past  
   ‘Taro, his (not Jiro's) leg kicked by Hanako.’  (Fukuda 2006:107 with modifications)

It is possible, and in fact very reasonable, to consider (i) to be an instance of indirect passive. (i) with the parenthesized part, which I add, is clearly an indirect passive. Moreover, zibun in (i) can be construed as coreferential with Hanako, which indicates that (i) is an indirect passive. Thus, examples like (i) do not constitute counter-evidence on the existence of possessor passive as structurally distinct from indirect passive.
Just like the direct passive (16), the possessor passive (15a) is to be analyzed as involving pro as described in (17):

(17) **[Possessor Passive in Japanese]**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[\text{v rare}] \rightarrow \text{pro} \\
\vdots \\
\text{DPint} \rightarrow <\sqrt{\text{TATAK}>} \\
\text{DP} \rightarrow \text{kao-o} \\
\text{John} \rightarrow [\text{acc}] / [\text{dat}] \\
\end{array}
\]

The amalgamation of the root and rare can license [acc] and [dat] in both (16) and (17). The minimum difference is that pro in (17) 'absorbs' [dat]. Then, the nominal head of DPint can bear [acc]; the non-head moves into Spec,TP for Case/EPP reasons. Since pro is an external argument in both (16) and (17), the ni/niiyotte phrase is an adjunct, being optional and unable to antecede the reflexive zibun. Like –EN, pro m-merged with rare is syntactically invisible, allowing DPint to move into Spec,TP and failing to antecede the reflexive zibun. In this way, the common properties of possessor and direct passives observed in (13) and (15) as well as the presence of accusative DP in (15) can be given a principled account.

I have analyzed direct and possessor passives in Japanese on a par; they involve the light verb rare with properties (i) and (ii), and designated nominal pro just as English passives are associated with –EN. Pro and –EN serve to cancel out properties (i) and, in the case of direct passives, (ii) as well. Moreover, the DP in Spec,TP is θ-related to the verbal root via its trace in (part of) object position, and no extra semantic interpretation needs to be imposed on it. In contrast, pro is not assumed to be present in the structures of indirect passives like (10b) and (11b) proposed in the previous section, and their subject is not θ-related to the verbal root, requiring an extra semantic interpretation on it.

English lacks indirect passives simply because English passives are formed with past participles, which necessarily involves –EN; the choice of not using -EN in passives is unavailable. It follows that other Germanic and Romance languages should share the property with English since they all employ past participles in forming passives. This prediction is apparently falsified by the existence of passives with accusative DPs in Germanic languages pointed out by Sigruðsson and Wood (2013). On closer examination, however, what look like indirect passives in those languages support my theory since their surface subject seems to be 'included' in the passive predicate, as exemplified by (18a,b)

(18) a. Ég fékk bókina senda (Icelandic)
   I-NOM got the book-ACC sent-PASS-ACC
   'I got the book sent to me.' (cited by Sigruðsson and Wood 2013 from Sigruðsson 2012:25)

b. Maria fick cykeln förstörd. (Swedish)
   got the bike destroy-PASS
   'Maria's bike got destroyed.' (cited by Sigruðsson and Wood 2013 from Klingvall 2011:61)

If –EN in (18a,b) absorbs [dat] and the external argument role of the passive verb, [acc] can be assigned to the object, and the surface subject position is filled by the argument 'included' in the passive verb phrase. If this analysis is correct, (18a,b) instantiate possessor or inclusive passive rather than indirect passive. In this way, the necessity to interpret Spec,TP non-thematically and the markedness of each type of passive are correlated with the presence/absence of a designated nominal element.

---

9 The internal argument in (17) is labeled as DP but can be analyzed as NP in the spirit of Fukui (1986). The latter possibility is more consonant with accusative Case-marking on the nominal head kao (face).

10 If property (ii) just refers to Case, as suggested in note 1, possessor passives show both properties.
5. Tr-NSs and Passives

If the unmarked usage of passive light verbs involves one nominal that cancels out their properties (i) and (ii), what about active transitive light verbs? Clearly, they should be assumed to involve no designated nominal since they typically manifest an external argument of the verbal root and [acc] on its internal DP argument as in (9a)/(10a) in Section 2. I have argued, however, that they can form a Tr-NS construction like (1b) and (4a) under certain conditions, where the external argument of the verbal root is suppressed just as in unmarked passives. Let us examine Tr-NSs in contrast to the three kinds of passive in Japanese.

Tr-NSs like (19) are quite close in meaning to possess or passives like (20), but are different in disallowing an agent phrase. On the other hand, Tr-NSs resemble indirect passives like (21) in the necessity to impose an extra semantic interpretations on Spec,TP, as has been discussed in Section 3.

The verbal root yabuk (rapture) is all realized as transitive in (19)-(21), but it also has the intransitive usage as has been exemplified in (3); yabuk is a transitivity alternation verb. Note in addition that the accusative-marked DP is komaku-no (Tom’s eardrum) in (21), but only the nominal head komaku in (19) and (20).

According to generalization (8) in Section 2, (19) is an acceptable Tr-NS since the verbal root yabuk does not intrinsically require an external argument. Thus, (19) can be analyzed as (22), where vP has no external argument. On the other hand, the possessor passive (20) is analyzed as (23), where the external argument of yabuk is realized as pro m-merged with rare. The possibility of an adjunct agent phrase exemplified in (19) and (20) correlates with the presence/absence of pro as an external argument.

In (22), the nominal head of DPint is Case-licensed by the root-v amalgam. Since vP has no external argument, the non-head John can move into that position, where it picks up a non-thematic interpretation ascribable to the functional head v. The non-head John ends up in Spec,TP for Case/EPP reasons. In (23), the head and non-head of DPint are Case-checked in the same manner. Since the external θ-role of the root is properly assigned to pro, the non-head does not pick up any semantic role within vP other than the possessor of the head of DPint.
Note that the external argument role is 'suppressed' in the Tr-NS (22) and the possessor passive (23) in distinct manners; due to the intrinsic nature of the root that allows transitivity alternation in (22), and pro m-merged with the verbal complex in (23). Pro also functions as an external argument in direct passives like (13)/(16) in the previous section. Therefore, direct and possessor passives are thematically on a par with active transitives like (9a)/(10a) in Section 3 in that the θ-grid of the verbal root is fully discharged within vP. The verbal root in Tr-NSs, on the other hand, 'chooses' the unaccusative thematic pattern despite its transitive PF realization, and this possibility is lexically restricted to transitivity alternation verbs.

Unlike direct and possessor passives, indirect passives like (21) do not involve pro. More specifically, (21) has an external argument like (23), but it is realized as a full DP rather than pro, as in (24).

(24) [Indirect Passive]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{DP*} \quad \ldots \ldots \ldots \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{Mary-ni} \quad \text{vP} \quad \sqrt{YABUK-}\text{v rare} \\
\text{Tom-no komaku-o} \quad \langle\sqrt{YABUK}\rangle \\
\text{DPint} \quad \text{DPext} \\
\text{[dat]} \\
\text{[acc]} \\
\end{array}
\]

DPint and DPext are θ-marked and Case-licensed within vP as described above. An extra argument DP* will fill up Spec,TP, which picks up a non-thematic interpretation ascribable to the verbal complex with rare. The DP*s in (22) and (24) are interpreted as being responsible for and affected by the event expressed by vP, respectively. The more marked status of indirect passives as compared to possessor passives is contingent on the absence of the designated nominal element pro in the former, which results in failing to cancel out properties (i).

If essentially the same kind of light verbs is involved in active and passive transitive constructions in any language as I have assumed so far, they are still expected to exhibit distinct properties in some principled manner; otherwise, only one light verb would be enough. For passives, the unmarked case involves pro, which cancels out property (i). In contrast, active transitives do not contain pro; they typically manifest property (i) and its cancellation is due to the lexical properties of verbal roots.

6. Summary

My main claim has been that active and passive transitive constructions contain light verbs that make available to the verbal roots (i) external argument and (ii) accusative Case. To support this, I have shown in Sections 2 and 3 that the transitive light verbs and the passive morpheme rare in Japanese can constitute parallel constructions under certain conditions: common transitives, Tr-NSs and indirect passives. On the other hand, I have argued in Section 4 that they typically constitute distinct constructions since rare in its unmarked usages (i.e., direct and possessor passives) involves the designated nominal pro, which cancels out (i) and, in the case of direct passives, (ii) as well, just as –EN does in English passives. Since pro is phonetically empty and need not be m-merged with rare, it can be absent, which results in indirect passive. English and other Germanic and Romance languages do not allow indirect passives since their passives necessarily involve the nominal –EN. In Section 5, I have returned to Tr-NSs as compared to the three kinds of passive in Japanese, and concluded that
active and passive light verbs, though sharing properties (i) and (ii), behave differently in a principled manner due to the latter's involvement of a designated nominal available in each language.
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